



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE
WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, M.P.,
ETC., ETC. :
A POLITICAL REVIEW.

THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE
WM. EWART GLADSTONE, M.P.,

ETC., ETC.:

A POLITICAL REVIEW.

BY

R. MASHEDER, B.A.,
AUTHOR OF "DISSENT AND DEMOCRACY."

"The point upon which we have to fix our attention is this. There is a strong disposition to overthrow the principle of an Established Church, and therein ultimately to deny that religion is the great sanction of civil society."—THE STATE IN ITS RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH (*Fourth Edition*, p. 397.)



LONDON:
SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, BROOK STREET, W.

MDCCCLXV.

[All rights reserved.]

210. f. 29.



LONDON:
WILLIAM STEVENS, PRINTER, 37, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1

CHAPTER I.

FROM 1833 TO 1842.

EXCLUSIVE SYSTEM OF STATE-CONNECTION	4
--	---

CHAPTER II.

FROM 1842 TO 1846.

TRANSITION PERIOD	73
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

FROM 1847 TO 1859.

RELIGIOUS EQUALITY—ENDOWMENT OF ALL RELIGIONS .	106
---	-----

CONTENTS.

SECTION II.

FROM 1859 TO PRESENT TIME.

	PAGE
RELIGIOUS EQUALITY—DISENDOWMENT OF ALL RELIGIONS	151

CHAPTER IV.

CONCLUSION	185
----------------------	-----

THE
RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.,
ETC.

INTRODUCTION.

IT has occurred to me to prefix this work with the invocation—

“Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine læso,
Quidque dolens regina Deum tot volvere casus
Insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores
Impulerit.”

Writing, however, *musâ pedestri*, I doubt whether, as a justification of what I intend, or as an index to my object, I could adopt a more suitable motto than *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*. I am equally persuaded that the subject of our consideration is not so well known as he deserves to be, and that, in consequence, he is, in some quarters, hugely magnified. My design, therefore, is to help to a better knowledge and a truer appreciation of him.

be needed for the book to make its
present state of public affairs intelligible, and
truly express that which is at present
not something more than a mere
Gladstone was a great man, and
long adversary of the Jews, and
his friends were not his enemies, and
impossible to see how the Jews
subject was treated in the book.
: M. 1. 1. 1. 1.

With this view, I propose to divide the work as follows:—Chapter I. will be devoted to the period when Mr. Gladstone advocated an exclusive system of Church and State connexion, from 1833 to 1842. Chapter II. will discuss the transition period, from 1842 to 1846. Chapter III. will treat of the religious equality period, from 1846 to the present time. This Chapter, however, will be subdivided into two sections, each treating of, apparently, a different phase of religious equality, the former dating from 1846 to 1859, and the latter from 1859 to 1865. Another and fourth Chapter will sum up our conclusions. The topics to be introduced, however, are mainly of a constitutional character, not financial, nor foreign.

With respect to the plan of the work, I wish to state that it is purposely so composed as to allow Mr. Gladstone to describe himself. It is, in fact, his own autobiography that I am publishing. For quoting so largely from Mr. Gladstone's own testimony, relative to himself and his opinions, I may plead, among other reasons, first, that I am wholly incapable of presenting so perfect a picture out of my own materials; and secondly, that, however skilfully I painted the same picture myself, it would never, I fear, be admitted to be a portrait, and much less a correct likeness. But of "garbling" I have kept clear, I trust. This much only I beg to premise here, that, from the first, the extracts presented should be read with a thought to subsequent disclosures.

If any apology be needed for the book, it may be found in the present state of public affairs and political parties ; but I willingly confess that one great incentive to its production was, something more than a rumour to the effect, that Mr. Gladstone was prepared to announce some policy of action adverse to the Irish Church, but was dissuaded by his friends from making what seemed a premature and impolitic announcement. I believe, however, that this subject was alluded to in his recent autumnal speech at Manchester.

CHAPTER I.

FROM 1833 TO 1842.

EXCLUSIVE SYSTEM OF STATE-CONNECTION.

THE subject of our sketch, the Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, was born at Liverpool in the year 1809. Having received the rudiments of his education in his native town, he was subsequently removed to Eton and Oxford, where he carried off what are termed double-first honours, in the year 1831. His public career dates from 1832, he having been returned at the General Election, by the influence of the Newcastle family, as one of the representatives for Newark. Accordingly it was in 1833 that Mr. Gladstone, then a student of Christ Church, first took his seat in Parliament, and in the first session of the first Reformed Parliament.

Of the state of public opinion and political parties at the time some account may be found in a previous

work.* At present, therefore, I forbear to dilate upon these matters.

As Mr. Gladstone took his seat on the Opposition benches, so, at the first, he joined himself cordially and consistently with the Conservative, or, rather, with the Tory party. His maiden speech (February 21) in support of Lord Sandon's return for Liverpool, is some proof of that statement. He also took a lively interest in colonial questions, especially such as concerned the island of Jamaica, where his family owned considerable estates. Coming, however, to what are more immediately the subjects of our review, it may safely be asserted that no measure of 1833 provoked more discussion than the Irish Temporalities Bill.

By this measure the Irish Bishops were reduced from 22 in number to 12, certain sinecures were abolished, the small livings were augmented, and Church Cess (or rate) was abolished, but in lieu thereof a tax was imposed on other revenues of the Church. The increased value to be conferred upon Church property, by the conversion of leases for 21 years into perpetuities, was, however, reserved by Clause 147, in order to be applied to secular objects. Ultimately, indeed, that clause was withdrawn, but its retention created no small amount of discussion on the second reading.

It may be doubted, indeed, whether Sir R. Peel

* See "Dissent and Democracy," pp. 34, 35.

would have contested the Bill had Clause 147 never been introduced; for he had expressly admitted that "he was ready to concede the principle that the Vestry Cess should be abolished, and a provision made for the charges which that cess was levied to defray, out of the revenues of the Church." By the ultra Tories, however, of whom Mr. Estcourt and Sir H. Inglis, then the representatives of Oxford University, were the leaders, the Irish Temporalities Bill was opposed on every ground and in nearly every one of its provisions. And it was in conjunction with this class of politicians that, on the third reading of the Bill, Mr. Gladstone took a prominent position in opposition to it, among other objections starting the following :—

Mr. Gladstone "was prepared to defend the Irish Church. He would admit that the Established Church of Ireland had long slumbered; but would contend that, since the Union, it had done all that human power could do. The question, however, was, not what it had done, but was it capable of being fitted for action? He contended that, in a social point of view, it was no slight advantage to have scattered over that country a number of men who were gentlemen by education, and, more especially, who were Christians by profession. The existence of such a body of men in that country was also of no slight importance, as affording a connecting-link between it and England. But he did not defend it on those grounds alone, nor was it on those grounds that he opposed the present Bill.

"He opposed it because he thought it would tend to desecrate the Established Church, and the desecration of a Church must be productive of the most serious injury to a country. He thought it was of the utmost advantage to a country to have a body capable of spreading and extending the Protestant doc-

trines ; and, without meaning any offence to his Catholic fellow-subjects, he could not but think that it would be productive of great benefit, in a national point of view, to have the means of expounding, defending, and maintaining those doctrines in an active manner. All he asked was that such fair opportunity should be given, and then, God defend the right. He feared that the probable effect of the Bill would be to place the Church on an untenable foundation.

“He was unwilling to see the number of Irish Bishops reduced, because he believed that in the course of time their duties would very materially increase, and when that was the case it would be a difficult matter to restore those whom they were now about to destroy.

“He did not pretend to have formed any opinion of his own upon the subject of the Vestry Cess ; but, looking to the opinions of those who were well informed on the subject, he was willing to believe that its abolition would be the means of extirpating a great source of heart-burning and irritation amongst the Irish people ; and for that reason he considered it to be a wise proceeding. *He had, however, always looked upon it to be a principle well established, that, as long as a Church was national, the nation ought to be taxed to support it ; and if the Government meant to maintain the Protestant Church in Ireland, they ought to enforce this maxim.*”

The above remarks are important, not only as an index to Mr. Gladstone's opinions when he entered Parliament, but as shadowing forth some of the great features in his character. In the first place, his special censure was reserved for what appears to have been one of the most salutary provisions of the Bill—the amalgamation of the Irish sees. In the second place, whilst justifying the abolition of Church Cess as a practical grievance, Mr. Gladstone contrived to outweigh that

justification by throwing into the other scale an abstract principle. Thirdly, the union of Church and State is based upon the most extreme of principles—"So long as a Church was national, the nation ought to be taxed to support it." Surely it is both a sounder and more tenable position which is held in maintaining that, so far from the nation supporting the Church, or being taxed to support it, the State simply secures to the Church, as to all other denominations, the free enjoyment of its own property.

Mr. Gladstone's zeal in behalf of the Irish Episcopate has been remarked upon. The true solution of that, as of many other problems in his career, is, I am convinced, to be found in a certain movement about this time developed at Oxford. I mean what is popularly known as the Tractarian Movement. Of the relations, however, between that movement and Mr. Gladstone's character and conduct, I shall not now treat. The discussion may be profitably postponed till we come to analyze his published works of 1838 and 1840.

Another measure of 1833, which deserves attention, was a proposal of Mr. R. Grant for the removal of Jewish Disabilities, with the view of putting the Jew on the same footing as the Roman Catholic. This Bill was also vigorously opposed by the Tory section, and on the four divisions taken upon it Mr. Gladstone was not only present, but voted with the Tories. Sir R. Peel was only once present on the third reading, but on that occasion he also voted in the Tory minority.

On the reintroduction of the same measure in 1834, Mr. Gladstone voted again with Sir H. Inglis on every division, and the motion was resisted and a division taken on all the three readings. Sir R. Peel, however, was absent on every division.

It was in this session, also, that Earl Grey's government brought forward a measure for admitting Dissenters to the Universities, by the abolition of all tests for degrees in honours; on the third reading of which Mr. Gladstone spoke thus:—

“In the first place, he could not but observe, whatever might be the propriety of the present measure, the House and the country were decidedly labouring under a delusion if they fancied that such an enactment could be practically carried into effect. The law might enact that the new student should be subject to no test of faith on his admittance, and to that law the Universities would be obliged to bow obedience. But it should be recollected that, before the ceremony of matriculation could take place, the Vice-Chancellor had to inquire of the new comer what college he belonged to. Here they were all abroad at once, for the tutors and heads of colleges, holding and being resolved to act up to the opinions they now entertained, would invariably refuse admittance to their respective colleges in the first instance. The Bill would consequently be inoperative. But though the present measure was not one which could work out the objects which were held in view by its promulgators, it was one which, if passed, must inevitably lead to great dissension and confusion, and eventually to endless applications and legislation in that House. He would, therefore, endeavour to vindicate the character of the University establishments of the country, and show, upon principle, why the present attempt to subvert their object and destroy their efficiency should be resisted by the House.

“It could not be denied that the object of the founders and

benefactors of these institutions (the Universities) was the maintenance of the Established Church, and the cultivation of its doctrines in the rising generation of the country. For 800 years that wholesome object had been kept in view, and the Universities had become the preparatory seminaries to the Church Establishment. Now, in a country where there were seminaries for all her professions, was it too much to demand that the Church should be allowed her seminaries too? The Universities had been spoken of as national institutions. He admitted the term, but not in the sense with which it was generally put forth. *They were undoubtedly national institutions, but only in so far as they were connected with the National Church.* The vital principle of these collegiate foundations was to provide a course of education which should attend to the moral character as well as the scientific attainments of their pupils. To attain this a certain fixed course of study and of discipline must be observed. But how could this be done when by the Bill before the House it was purposed to throw open their doors, not only to Dissenting Christians of every sect and denomination, but also to all sorts of persons, be they Christians or not?

“To show still further the dread with which the present measure was looked upon by all the respectable individuals concerned in the government of the University of Oxford, he would beg to read one passage from the Memorial they recently drew up upon the subject. Those learned and respectable individuals said, ‘The University of Oxford has always considered religion to be the foundation of all education, and they cannot themselves be parties to any system of instruction which does not retain this foundation. They also protest against the notion that religion can be taught on the vague and comprehensive principle of admitting persons of every creed. When they speak of religion they mean the doctrines of the Gospel as revealed in the Bible, and as maintained by the Church of England, as settled at the period of the Reformation; as, on the one hand, they cannot allow those doctrines to be suppressed, so, on the other, they cannot consent that they should be ex-

plained or taught in any sense which is not in accordance with the recognised tenets of the Church of England.'

"What, he would ask, was he to gather from this solemn declaration? What did it mean but this, that, if the House were to attempt to compel these respectable teachers to act contrary to their conscientious and fixed resolutions, they would virtually abrogate their functions? He very much feared that the House, in establishing their present principle of religious liberty, would drive from their functions men who had so long done honour and service to their country, and thus inaugurate their reign of religious peace by an act of the grossest tyranny."

These arguments call for no remark, except it be to note their uncompromising character, and the absolute exclusiveness attached to the Universities. But their piquancy will be better appreciated when contrasted with what follows, on the same subject. I may add, that during this session Mr. Gladstone voted, but did not speak, in favour of Lord Althorp's resolution on Church Rates, which was also supported by Sir R. Peel and the Conservative party generally, but ultimately withdrawn.

It was in the autumn of 1834 that, Lord Melbourne's Ministry having been abruptly dismissed, Sir R. Peel succeeded to office, and Mr. Gladstone was selected to fill the post of Under-Secretary for the Colonies.

In the spring of 1835, and in the new Parliament, the Whigs being then in opposition, Lord J. Russell himself resuscitated the proposal which he and his party had resisted from the Ministerial benches in 1834. I refer to what is known as the Appropriation

Clause. On this motion Mr. Gladstone's vehemence found vent as follows:—

“He thought Church property was as sacred as private property; but between private property and Church property he saw a difference. He should say that the former was sacred in persons, and the latter to purposes. Whatever decision they might come to on the question before them, he was borne out in the opinion *that the present motion was merely initiatory, that it would open a boundless road, that it would lead to measure after measure, to expedient after expedient, till at last they came to this conclusion—namely, the recognition of the Roman Catholic religion as the national one.* In principle they proposed to give up the Protestant Establishment. If so, why not propose to abandon the political government of Ireland, to cede the Repeal of the Legislative Union? But no; the Protestant Church was to be first given up. When that had been done, what answer would be given to the demand for a Repeal of the Union, founded on the complaint of misgovernment?

“The proposition to which the noble Lord (Lord J. Russell) invited the House to assent was alike impracticable and unjustifiable: impracticable, because the moral means of maintaining the state of things it proposed to create would be lost; unjustifiable, because there was no principle upon which the Protestant Church Establishment could be rightly or permanently upheld, but that it was the Establishment which taught the truth. The Government, as a Government, was bound to maintain that form of belief which it conceived to contain the largest portion of truth with the smallest admixture of error. Upon that ground the Government of this country maintained the Protestant, and declined to maintain the Catholic religion.

“In New England, formerly, the Government called upon each individual to support the religion he belonged to. He hoped that he should never live to see the day when such a system should be adopted in this country; for the consequences of it to public men, and to the character of the country, would

be lamentable beyond all description. *If those individuals who were called upon to fill the high functions of administering public affairs should be compelled to exclude from their consideration the elements of true religion, and to view various strange and conflicting doctrines in the same light, instead of administering those noble functions, they would become helots and slaves.* If the separation of Church and State was hastening on, the present motion, instead of retarding it, would increase its rapidity."

This extract is noteworthy, as being an adumbration of Mr. Gladstone's principle, subsequently developed in the work "The State in its Relations with the Church," of which hereafter. Meanwhile I may remark that, Lord John Russell having carried no less than three motions within a fortnight, on the Appropriation principle, Mr. Gladstone returned, together with his party, to the Opposition benches. But an episode occurred in this year too tempting to omit in any enumeration of Mr. Gladstone's exploits, and which will be easily understood from the context.

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Spring Rice) rose to postpone the First Order of the Day, the Consolidated Fund Bill. His motive, however, for postponing the Order of the Day was that the Militia Estimates were not voted, and he could not add the Appropriation Clause.

"Mr. Hume said, that while the three great and most important questions were pending in another place, he thought it would be highly improper in the House to pass any more money clauses. He did not wish to deny to another place the free exercise of its powers; but some discretion was required on the part of that House. He repeated that the members of the House of Commons, acting on behalf of the people of their country, were called on at the present crisis not to agree to any

more votes of money, nor for the appropriation of that already granted.

“Mr. O’Connell said, that undoubtedly the control of the public funds was a constitutional power belonging to the Commons of England. If it was found that the amelioration of the abuses existing in our institutions, and the advancement of the necessary reforms, were to be impeded, the Commons would exercise their constitutional control over the public exchequer, and would place it in the hands of those who had the confidence of the people, so as to render any perseverance in a systematic opposition to the improvements required by the people impossible.

“Mr. W. E. Gladstone did not object to the postponement of the Order of the Day, neither did he question the power of the House to exercise its high privileges for other and ulterior objects than the mere acceleration or suspension of a particular part of a Bill. But he rose to say that, although the House had the power of carrying into execution the threat of suspending the granting of public money for the general emergencies of the State, yet he felt in honour and conscience bound to state that there could be nothing more indiscreet, nothing more indecent—he would retract the word indecent, and say, nothing more indelicate—than for a minister of the Crown to ground his postponement of a financial Bill on the presumption of the course of conduct that another branch of the Legislature might pursue, respecting certain legislative measures that were submitted to their consideration in their independent capacity; and that other branch of the Legislature was as independent as this branch of the Legislature, and as capable of exercising a sound and useful judgment. He deplored the spirit that seemed to guide the Government, and he could not sufficiently reprobate the mind that ruled the actions of those sections of various parties that whirled the Government round within the eddies of an all-absorbing agitation. It was because the hon. members opposite threatened to overawe the monarchy and the other branch of the Legislature, which was the original barrier

between the usurpations of the Crown and the licentiousness of the people;—it was because that it was useful, and wise, and just that both branches should harmonize and attune with each other, that he could not before really have imagined that a minister of the Crown would act on such motives as the speeches of the two last hon. members would seem to show influenced the conduct of the right hon. gentleman.

“The Chancellor of the Exchequer knew not what might be the notions of decency and delicacy which the hon. gentleman might entertain for his own government; but those which he himself entertained of both the one and the other would command him to do justice to the conduct of a political opponent, and not, without good ground, bring against him a charge of proceeding upon unconstitutional doctrines. He had stated that the delay which the hon. gentleman had ventured to characterize as indecent and indelicate had been produced, not at all by his right hon. friends or by that House, but, in point of fact, by the delay which had been given to the Militia Bill by the House of Lords itself. If the hon. gentleman had been a little more conversant with the forms of Parliament, or if he had paid a little attention to the statements made, he could not have resorted to the personal attack which he had ventured to make. He must then have known that for the Minister of the Crown to propose the Appropriation Clause without having had the Militia Estimates voted would be equivalent to leaving the militia unpaid for the next 12 months. On what ground could the hon. gentleman venture to refer to his Majesty’s Government as forgetful of their duty to the Crown, or of that respect which he, for one, should always entertain for a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature? Observations might have been made, indeed, tending to connect the delay with other causes; but what had he to do with them? The hon. gentleman seemed to proceed upon the supposition of a distinction between the interests of the people and the interests of the Crown: that was the true Tory doctrine, and it might well become the hon. gentleman to advance it. The hon. gentleman might con-

sider that such a distinction was to be made; for his part, he could only say that, in his eyes, none could exist or be recognised.

“Mr. W. E. Gladstone said he was misunderstood by the right hon. gentleman. He begged to thank the right hon. gentleman, however, for the ground on which he put the postponement of the clause. If he applied unpalatable language to the right hon. gentleman, supposing that his postponement of the clause had reference to discussions pending in another place, and which a threatened vote of this House would be supposed to overawe, he begged, after the explanation of the right hon. gentleman, to say that he was entirely content. It was his pleasure, as well as it was his duty, to retract that language as regarded the right hon. gentleman. However, he did not retract the language as referring to the sentiments that he heard uttered on the other side of the House; and now he would transfer it from the right hon. gentleman to the two hon. members opposite (Mr. Hume and Mr. O’Connell); for they had advanced atrocious and dangerous doctrines, tending to upset all freedom and independence of action in the other branch of the Legislature, which had as sound a constitutional right of judgment as that House.

“Mr. O’Connell accepted the transfer, and returned it, with much contempt for the hon. member’s argument. It was a doctrine slavish in the extreme which had dictated such remarks as those of the hon. gentleman.

“Mr. Hume said he would not accept the transfer, because the opinions of the hon. gentleman showed his ignorance.

“Mr. C. Buller, as an old Member of Parliament, would make one recommendation to the hon. gentleman the member for Newark—namely, before he made a violent attack on a political adversary, he should carefully attend to what that adversary said. The hon. gentleman, with that tender Tory conscience of which he seemed to boast, wished to have it thought that he despised the possession of the public purse. The true representatives of the people would not despise it,

because they knew it to be the safeguard of the people's liberties.

"Lord John Russell said, that on a simple statement to the effect that, until the Militia Estimates were agreed to, it would be impossible that the appropriation of the supplies for the year could be determined, the hon. member for Newark thought fit to raise up an accusation against the Ministers of the Crown, and to charge them with conduct which was indecent and indelicate—to charge them with not doing their duty to their sovereign, and putting off a Bill which ought to be now immediately considered. It is quite true that these expressions of opinion have been withdrawn; but I am not surprised that, when accusations of this kind are made, and when they are followed up by what I think was not withdrawn, a dictation to this House with regard to the question of Supplies—namely, to tell this House that it was not for them to decide whether they ought to be voted, but that the hon. gentleman opposite had a right to lay down the certain times and periods at which the Supplies should be made complete—I say, when speeches of this kind are made, comprehending, in the first place, an accusation, which was proved to be totally unfounded, against the Ministers of the Crown, and which a single minute's attention would have prevented, and when they contain, in the second place, what was very like a rebuke to the House, by declaring when and how the House of Commons should vote the supplies—I repeat, when language of such a description is used, I am not astonished that it should excite not a little of angry discussion."

Unhappily this display of temper is not the only occurrence of the kind I shall have to chronicle, severe as were the rebukes it entailed. Is it that the malady is constitutional? Another reflection suggested by the extract is one calculated to turn our thoughts to the strange revolutions that have been wrought in the relative positions of public men since the *mitis sapientia*

of Lord John Russell was invoked to calm the bursting torrent of Mr. Gladstone's invective in 1835 against an imaginary encroachment upon the privileges of the Peers.

The next occasion on which Mr. Gladstone took a decided course was in 1837, when Mr. Spring Rice moved his resolution to abolish Church Rates, and to provide a substitute out of the surplus to be created by an improved management of Church property. It will be seen how effectually Mr. Gladstone then dealt with all the sentimental objections of Dissenters, and how, with no less power or ardour, he demolished several of his present colleagues, and still more of his present allies.

Mr. Gladstone "would read a short passage on this subject, from Chief Justice Holt, an authority entitled to the utmost respect. 'By the civil and canon law the parson is obliged to repair the whole church, and it is so in all Christian kingdoms but England; but, by the peculiar laws of this country, the parishioners are charged with the repairs of the body of the church.'

"The Government proposed to transfer a sum of £250,000 a year from the Church Estates to the pockets of the holders of land and houses in the country. It was true there was an intermediate party, and that what was taken from the Church Estates was in the first instance to be devoted to the maintenance of the fabric of the church. But it was also true that what was now assigned for that purpose was put into the pockets of the landholders. He, therefore, contended that it was the same, in point of principle, as if they took it directly from the Estates of the Church and gave it to the land. Were the majority of landholders in the country Dissenters?"

"The ludicrous, though not the most objectionable part of the plan was this: that it would remit nine-tenths of the amount to members of the Church of England, the Dissenters paying but a very trivial sum of the £250,000 now required for Church Rates.

"But it was said that the Dissenters were actuated in their resistance to Church Rates by a scruple of conscience. It might be a matter of dislike, objection, or opposition, and it might be right or wrong in that respect, but it was no scruple of conscience. His principle was this: when the Legislature made a demand on its subjects for a part of their property, whatever might be the purpose to which it was applied, the demand of the Legislature absolved the conscience of its subjects. They might use every means of getting rid of it; but, as long as the payment was law, no scruple of conscience could fairly resist it. Was it a scruple of conscience to depart from an obligation which had been voluntarily undertaken, when the property was purchased under that obligation?

"The argument was advanced against hon. gentlemen who sat on that side of the House, from the remission of the Vestry Cess in the Irish Church Bill. He felt that those who had voted against that Bill were, nevertheless, committed by the principle of the remission of Vestry Cess. Gentlemen on that side, with some individual exceptions, did not object to that principle, and were not now disposed to shrink from it; but, adhering to that principle, they were still free to resist such remission of Church Rates as was proposed by the present plan. The remission of Vestry Cess was urged and granted on two grounds. The first was, that the revenues of the Church were more than sufficient for the purposes which the Established Church was intended to accomplish; the second, that cess was not a fixed property, like tithes. Now, it having been assumed that Church Rate was different in its nature from tithe, and it being likewise alleged that the revenues of the Church in Ireland were sufficient to supply funds for the purposes of the rate, he was justified in saying, that the abolition of the impost was conceded on a two-

fold ground : that none of the property of the Church would be surrendered by that step ; and that it would not at all interfere with the full accomplishment of the purposes for which the Church was established. But was that the case in England ? Were the purposes of the Church accomplished ? and if they were not, could the remission of Vestry Cess in Ireland be alleged as a precedent for the remission of the sums now levied by way of Church Rate ?

“ He had asked if the purposes of the Church were satisfied, and he would now ask, what was the principle of a Church Establishment of which they heard so much ? He would assert that the maintenance of a single community in its endowments was not the main principle of an Established Church. The principle of an Establishment was this : to carry home to the door of every man in the country, who was willing to receive them, the blessings of religion, and the ordinances which its ministers were appointed to dispense. He did not mean to say that he would hold the principle of the inviolability of Church property to such an extreme degree as to say, that the whole of its revenues should be maintained to the Establishment, whether they were required or not ; but where, as in this country, the revenues of the Church were scarcely sufficient for those great purposes to which it was destined, the mutilation of any branch of its revenues, or the curtailment of its resources, would be an infraction of the most sacred duty of the Legislature.

“ But most of all had they reason to complain of the Government plan when they compared it with the previous professions of ministers. In 1835 the noble lord (J. Russell) did not occupy the same prominent station he now held, and only lent his colleagues his occasional assistance. But when the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume) attempted to establish by a resolution a principle far less objectionable than that which was embodied in the resolution before them, the noble lord was so struck with its impolicy that he said, ‘ I feel it incumbent on me to come forward to declare the opinions I entertain in opposition to those of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Harvey). I should

be wanting in candour if I did not state that the reason why the hon. gentleman and his friends are continually disappointed is this—that there is a difference of principle between us. I maintain that there may be a Church Establishment maintained by the State by means of compulsory payments, and yet that there may be the most perfect religious freedom.’

“The noble lord, he was aware, still adhered verbally to this declaration ; but if he really did hold the principle of a Church Establishment, he must admit the demands of the Dissenters to be unreasonable, and would refuse to sacrifice to them the spiritual wants of the population. In 1836 the noble lord was afraid to avow his real principles, and was at the same time averse to declare open war on the Established Church. But was this paltering with principles worthy of a statesman ? Was it consonant with that regard to the dictates of uncompromising rectitude which ought to govern his conduct ? The noble lord was afraid to introduce a Bill similar in its provisions to that proposed by Lord Althorp in 1834, because, though its effect would be beneficial to the Church, it would be injurious to the party to whom he belonged. The noble lord foresaw that the consequence would be the falling off of the Dissenters, and the loss of the influence which that body could exercise in the elections, and could not venture to run the risk of losing several votes in that House by the introduction of such a plan. The first native hue of his resolution was sicklied over with the pale cast of thought. The reluctant hesitation, the repeated deliberations of Government, their successive postponements of the question, coupled with the nature of the plan before the House, compelled him to charge them with being actuated, in the course they had taken in this measure, more by a regard for party considerations than for the real interests of the Church and the country.

“It was painful to him to be obliged thus to characterize the policy of ministers ; but he felt that he should not be doing his duty if he refrained from speaking his sentiments. *He was convinced that by agreeing to the plan of the Government they*

of the prisoners, he apprehended that the House would not recognise the sufficiency of that plea, if set up by any class of poor persons out of doors, dissenting from the Established Church, in favour of a provision for their religious instruction."

It only remains to add, that Mr. Langdale's motion was carried by 131 against 30; that Sir R. Peel voted in the majority; that among the minority were Mr. Gladstone, Colonels Perceval and Verner, and that the tellers for the minority were Sir H. Inglis and Mr. Estcourt, the members for Oxford University.

In the week following (July 30), the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Spring Rice) having moved, in Committee of Supply, a vote of £8928 for the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, the vote was stubbornly contested by three gallant Colonels in succession—Colonel Sibthorp, Colonel Perceval, and Colonel Verner—upon which occurred the "scene" appended.

Mr. O'Connell "was sorry that the three gallant Colonels opposite, the Church-militant, he supposed, of that House, had not the courage to divide against this grant; for, if they had had such courage, he should certainly have divided with them, for this grant was most decidedly against the voluntary principle, which, in matters of religion, he should always uphold: they only talked—they would not divide. (The three gallant Colonels conversed together for a short time.) Now there is a council of war holding, and let us see what the results will be. Oh! these gallant Colonels! I must venture a parody against them:—

Three Colonels in three different counties born,
Did Lincoln, Sligo, and Armagh adorn;

The first in gravity of face surpassed,
 In grace the second, sobriety the last.
 The force of Nature could no further go—
 To beard the first, she shaved the other two.

“It was, however, but a paltry return for their giving a million to the Protestant clergy of Ireland, to refuse so paltry a grant as £8900 for the education of the Roman Catholic clergy of that country.”

Mr. Gladstone said, “The hon. and learned member for Dublin (O’Connell) boasted of having given £1,000,000 to the Protestant clergy of Ireland. Would the hon. and learned gentleman be kind enough to inform the House of the amount of the sum which he had been instrumental in withholding from them? *He objected to the grant then before the House, because it contravened and stultified the main principle on which the Established Church of England in Ireland was founded.*”

Later on in the debate Lord Morpeth rose and said—

“If they were to be always talking of the objectionable doctrines taught at Maynooth, they must not be surprised if they sometimes heard of the not very satisfactory doctrines which had recently become fashionable at Oxford. A book had been published lately, which certainly would be likely to make disciples of a new school, and which, he was given to understand, proceeded from that University. It was a work called ‘The Remains of the Rev. R. H. Froude,’ and was published, he believed, by Mr. Newman, who was the Principal of one of the colleges in Oxford. Mr. Froude said—

“‘You will be shocked at my avowal that I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation.

“‘It appears to be plain that, in all matters which seem to us indifferent or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unknown. We cannot know about any seeming different

practice of the Church of Rome, that it is not a development of the apostolic *æres*, and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the first six centuries; they must find a disproof, if they would do anything.

“I think people are injudicious who talk against the Roman Catholics for worshipping saints and honouring the Virgin and images, &c. These things may perhaps be idolatrous; I cannot make up my mind about it.

“Your trumpety principle about Scripture being the sole rule of faith in fundamentals (I nauseate the word) is but a mutilated edition, without the breadth and axiomatic character of the original.

“Really, I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalistic spirit they set afloat is the *ψευδοπροφήτης* of the Revelation.’

“He therefore called upon hon. gentlemen to look at home before they threw their missiles of invective abroad in future.”

Mr. W. E. Gladstone “had never heard a speech more cruelly unjust than that made by the noble lord. Even if Roman Catholic principles were inculcated in the University of Oxford, that fact had properly no relation to the question; but he had no hesitation in characterizing the assertion as a mere vulgar calumny. If the noble lord would read the preface of the book he had quoted, he would find that the editor expressly guarded himself against being supposed to entertain the opinions of the author, and stated that he gave it to the world as a singular production of a remarkable mind.”

This, I may remark, is the only recognition I have found in Hansard of the Tractarian movement. As to Mr. Gladstone’s remonstrance, I shall shortly be able, I trust, to throw some light upon its origin. But first I would observe, that all Mr. Gladstone’s biographers appear to agree upon this point, that, up to 1838, he

either supported or willingly allowed the Maynooth Grant; that in that year he condemned it, though no decided opposition was raised against it; and that, as we shall hereafter find, in 1845 he strenuously advocated the grant, even when trebled.

Here, for the present, our narrative of parliamentary events must be cut short by a brief retrospect of Mr. Gladstone's work—

“THE STATE IN ITS RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH.”

Originally published in 1838, a fourth edition, “revised and enlarged,” was issued in 1841. In every edition, however, the following Dedication appears:—

“Inscribed to the University of Oxford, tried and not found wanting, through the vicissitudes of a thousand years, in the belief that she is providentially designed to be a fountain of blessings, spiritual, social, and intellectual, to this and to other countries, to the present and future times, and in the hope that the temper of these pages may be found not alien from her own.”

No Preface, properly so called, was prefixed except to the fourth edition, and the only interest attaching to that is its unequivocal endorsement, so late as 1841, of the sentiments of the earlier editions. This will be self-evident from the following extracts:—

“In an age which inclines to secularize the State, and ultimately to curtail or overthrow civil liberty, by the subtraction of its religious guarantees, to declaim against intolerance becomes a secondary duty, and it is infinitely more important, and, as it seems to me, more rational, to plead earnestly for those great ethical

laws under which we are socially constituted, and which economical speculations and material interests have threatened altogether to subvert. I do not, therefore, repent my effort, but I repent of its numberless imperfections, and deplore the prejudicial results which they must have had in obstructing my general design. *I have only to add, that the spirit and intention of the book, and the principles upon which its whole argument was constructed, remain altogether unchanged. Nor am I aware that a single sentence or expression has been added which at the time of its first publication I should have been inclined to disavow.*"

It is clear, therefore, that, up to 1842, Mr. Gladstone held by the principles of his first work, "The State in its Relations with the Church." I may also remark, that in the year when the above preface was written, Mr. Gladstone completed the 32nd year of his age, and the ninth of his Parliamentary experience. It is from the third edition, however, published in 1839, that I quote, and I shall quote freely, in order that Mr. Gladstone's principles, up to 1842 at least, may be fully determined, upon his own testimony.

In discussing, then, the relations that ought to subsist between the State and the Church, the following leading propositions were laid down :—

"That, both as a combination of moral individual persons, and as the active organ of the national personality; both as having a conscience, and for the sake of national benefits; both for positive reasons to procure advantage, and for negative reasons to avoid detriment, the governing body or state, in order fully to discharge its duties, must seek, must profess, must support, must propagate a religion; must profess it personally and collectively; must propagate it freely and persua-

sively, indirectly and by the use of instruments; of the instruments made ready to its hand by that Divine ordinance which has separated for ever a class of men to minister in the Christian sanctuary."

It must be observed that Mr. Gladstone's inquiry had reference to this country, and to this country alone, in its application. He started, indeed, with an abstract conception of Government, and by examining whether that abstract conception comprised a capacity, and consequent duty, on the part of a Government, to exercise a choice upon religion. But, having answered that question affirmatively, he straightway applied his conclusions to the concrete—to British Government. One reason for writing the treatise is stated by himself to have been his conviction that neither Warburton, Coleridge, Chalmers, nor Paley

"Regarded the subject in the aspect most imperatively required by present circumstances; namely, that which shows that Governments are by 'dutiful necessity' cognizant of religious truth and falsehood, and bound to the maintenance and propagation of the former."

How that "dutiful necessity" arose is further stated:—

"Because, therefore, the Government stands with us in a paternal relation to the people, and is bound in all things to consider not merely their existing tastes, but the capabilities and ways of their improvement; because it has both an intrinsic competency and external means to amend and assist their choice; because, to be in accordance with God's word and will, it must have a religion, and because, in accordance with its conscience,

that religion must be the truth, as held by it under the most solemn and accumulated responsibilities; because this is the only sanctifying and preserving influence of society, as well as to the individual that particular benefit without which all others are worse than valueless,—we must disregard the din of political dissension, and the pressure of worldly and momentary motives, and, in behalf of our regard to man, as well as our allegiance to God, maintain among ourselves, where happily it still exists, the union between the Church and the State.”

For Mr. Gladstone had before stated, that though the religion of the State must be that of the governing body, yet in England, at least, it could only be “*the English Church.*”

Moreover, this religion of the English Church was to be alone supported and propagated, to the exclusion of all others, regard being had, however, to existing “contracts” with other denominations, as, for instance, with the Scotch Church.

“While the doctrine of ‘one body’ is authoritatively declared by Scripture, to recognise the Christian religion in separate bodies might be to countenance the sin which lies somewhere, though it may be hidden, or may be divided among many offending parties, in every such putting asunder of what God has united.”

With respect, again, to that support and propagation of religion by the State, Mr. Gladstone remarks—

“As to the duty of active pecuniary support to the National Church, that must depend upon our abilities. If we are absolutely precluded from its performance for the time, let it be considered as suspended. In that negative state with regard to *propagation* we may acquiesce; but let us not be led into the

fatal error of establishing all creeds, or affirm a false principle merely because we want power to carry out the true one."

In short, Mr. Gladstone's theory required that the Church should be supported by the State, not that the Church's endowments should be merely secured to her by the law of the land. It was the same principle which, in 1833, he stated that he had always looked upon as well established, that—

"As long as a Church was national, the nation ought to be taxed to support it."

In the same spirit, as we shall hereafter find, Mr. Gladstone, in 1861, designated Church Rate by the word "tax." This theory, however, that Church property is national property is the Alpha and the Omega of the Anti-State Church party—their great argument for, as they term it, the resumption of Church property by the State, as being its own, and its application to "secular uses."

To proceed : this point seems also clear, that though Mr. Gladstone protested against persecution on account of religious opinions, he deemed conformity to the Established Church an indispensable qualification for all civil offices. Macaulay, indeed, in his review of Mr. Gladstone's book, gave this as his inference :—

"Unless we have greatly misunderstood him, Mr. Gladstone would think it his duty, if he had the power, to revive the Test Act, to enforce it rigorously, and to extend it to important classes who were formerly exempt from its operation."

Certain it is that Mr. Gladstone, up to 1842, contemplated the permanent exclusion of the Jew, as well from municipal as from parliamentary privileges. He did more. So far as his votes and speeches could go, he resolutely acted upon his exclusive theory, as will appear in due course. To show how fearless, indeed, were his speculations upon the relations of Church and State, take the following specimen :—

“This I do not scruple to affirm, that, if a Mahometan conscientiously believes his religion to come from God and to teach Divine truth, he must believe that truth to be beneficial, and beneficial beyond all other things, to the soul of man ; and he must, therefore, and ought to desire its extension, and to use for its extension all proper and legitimate means ; and that, if such a Mahometan be a prince, he ought to count among those means the application of whatever influence or funds he may lawfully have at his disposal for such purposes.”

Other extracts, especially some on the Irish Church and the Maynooth Grant, would sound equally portentous ; but I reserve them for future contrasts. Here I may remark, that the object of Mr. Gladstone's work, “The State in its Relations with the Church,” seems to have been quite as much to propagate and fortify his religious as his political opinions. I should say, indeed, that the work was written to build up and give effect to certain foregone conclusions of religious questions. Mr. Gladstone's Shibboleth was Anglicanism. Having settled his own religious creed and exalted it far above every other system, he naturally

concluded, first, that the State ought to have relations of union with some religion ; secondly, that these relations must be with Anglicanism ; and thirdly, that they could subsist legitimately with no other creed, according to his hypothesis of Church and State. Thus his theory of the relations between Church and State resolved itself into a contrivance for supporting and propagating Anglicanism.

This, indeed, seems plain enough on reading his book. It is quite as much a dissertation on Church principles as on political science. With a power and facility all his own, and which I commend to the notice of certain High Churchmen, who now dream of nothing but Erastianism in the union of Church and State, Mr. Gladstone has shown most elaborately that the union of Church and State is more particularly needful for the former, in preserving its dogmas "whole and undefiled," and in producing "the greatest holiness of the greatest number." The whole of Chapter III. turns upon this subject, but space forbids to quote further.

It may, however, prove interesting, and it is not immaterial to my object, to point out somewhat in detail Mr. Gladstone's theory of the English Church, with which alone he held it to be incumbent upon the State to have connexion. The best reflection, then, so far as I can judge, of Mr. Gladstone's views on the Church is that emitted from Dr. Newman's "*Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*." As before stated, it was in 1833 that

the Tractarian movement assumed a tangible and public shape, and Mr. Gladstone, apparently, was not one whit behind its chiefest apostles in his assertion of the *Via Media*, or Anglican principles.

First, then, let us hear Dr. Newman. Of the English Reformation he thus writes :—

“ *Not any religious doctrine at all, but a political principle, was the primary English idea at that time of ‘Popery.’ And what was that political principle, and how could it be best kept out of England? What was the great question in the days of Henry and Elizabeth? The Supremacy. The supremacy of the Pope was the essence of the ‘Popery’ to which, at the time of the Articles, the supreme head or governor of the English Church was so violently hostile.*”

So much for Dr. Newman’s theory. What says Mr. Gladstone?

“ *That the question of the English Reformation was eminently and specially national; that it was raised as between the island of the free on the one hand, and an ‘Italian priest’ on the other, is a remarkable truth.*”

Again, he says—

“ *The British Government required of its subjects the renunciation, not of Romish doctrine, but of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope.*”

Again, Dr. Newman informs us that—

“ *The fundamental principle of the movement of 1833 was the principle of dogma; my battle was with Liberalism; by Liberalism, I meant the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments.*”

By Mr. Gladstone—

“Dogma” was identified with “the revealed truth of God,” and with “the means which God, in His mercy, has provided by revelation,” as opposed “to that principle of religious Liberalism into which Protestantism is apt to degenerate.”

With Dr. Newman, then, the object of the Tractarian movement was to uphold—

“Primitive Christianity; to effect a second Reformation—a better Reformation; for it would be a return, not to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth, to that Primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and which was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies, and by the Anglican divines,”

such as Laud, Bramhall, Usher, Andrewes, Taylor, Hammond, Stillingfleet, Barrow, Beveridge, Wilson, and especially Bishop Bull. In short, what was meant by Anglican principles was—

“Taking *Antiquity*, not the *existing Church*, as the oracle of truth; and holding that the *Apostolical Succession* is a sufficient guarantee of sacramental grace, *without union with the Christian Church throughout the world.*”

Dr. Newman’s second principle was that of the sacramental system:—

“I was confident in the truth of a certain definite religious teaching, based upon this foundation of dogma; viz., that there was a visible Church with sacraments and rites, which are the channels of invisible grace. And further, as to the episcopal system, what to me was *jure divino* was the voice of my Bishop in his own person. My own Bishop was my Pope; I knew no

other; the successor of the apostles, the vicar of Christ. This was but a practical exhibition of the Anglican theory of Church government, as I had already drawn it out myself."

The third fundamental principle of Anglicanism was "opposition to the Church of Rome." In furtherance of such principles, Dr. Newman aimed at making Anglicanism an integral system, not merely a positive, but an objective, real, and substantive religion.

Compare now with Dr. Newman's principles the following theories of Mr. Gladstone:—

"The English Church superadds to the evidence and guarantees of the Word, of Sacraments, of Creeds, and of primitive practices, a perpetual succession of clergy by whom these have been received, as they were delivered in regular order from hand to hand, and thus supplies us with a living voice of perpetual witnesses, in addition to those which are not active without a human agency to set them in motion."

Again—

"The true interests of a Church are best to be ascertained by considering its nature. It is an organized body, governed by the laws and ministers of Christ, having the charge of the Word, and the exclusive administration of the Sacraments, and dispensing both for the promotion of a spiritual life."

Again—

"Now, our principle is, that there is one revealed Catholic Church, of which the apostolical succession in the ministry is a condition, as well as truth of doctrine; one in body as well as in spirit, and having that succession as appertaining essentially to its body."

With respect to his later work, "Church Principles," published in 1840, Mr. Gladstone expressly declared that its object was—

"To present a familiar, or at least a partial, representation of the moral characteristics and effects of those doctrines which are now, perhaps, more than ever felt in the English Church to be full of intrinsic value—the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, of the apostolical succession in the ministry, of the authority of the Church in matters of faith, of the things signified in the sacraments."

Of these principles Mr. Gladstone adds—

"That they are strictly its *principia* or elements, and that all of them are easily to be extracted by analysis from the idea of the Church, as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic."

Hence Mr. Gladstone believed in—

"An immutable objective truth in religion, necessary to salvation; a substantive, changeless truth of God revealed: *a truth extrinsic to us and independent of us, neither owning nor owing to us any obligation. We profess to hold the one objective, permanent, unchangeable truth of religion; a thing given to us and not discovered, not even discovered from Scripture, by us; given to us, moreover, in the form of a visible, known, conspicuous, public institution.*"

Mark, again, the following. Quoth Mr. Gladstone—

"I, at least, utter it as my own firm, deliberate, and governing persuasion, that those catholic or primitive principles not only do not naturally lead into Romanism, but are the one barrier which effectually closes the way thither to persons of an ardent, and, at the same time, a confiding spirit; that, as heretofore, for many generations, they have counteracted the false

opinions that lead to religious division, so now they are the specific remedy providentially ordained and adapted to meet a danger to which unqualified Protestantism must ever be open in periods of great religious excitement."

Now for Dr. Newman's testimony :—

"I think these still the firmest, strongest ground against Rome, that is, *if they can be held*. They have been held by many, and are far more difficult to refute, in the Roman controversy, than those of any other religious body. For myself, I found I could not hold them. I left them."

In both Mr. Gladstone's view, therefore, and Dr. Newman's, the bases of the Anglican system, that is, of their conception of the Church of England, were Antiquity, Apostolicity, and Catholicity. Hence the Church's authority in matters of faith. For, according both to Dr. Newman and to Mr. Gladstone, she holds, and she alone can hold, the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*.

Dr. Newman, indeed, affirmed as a proposition—

"*Self-evident, as soon as stated, to those who have at all examined the structure of Scripture; viz., that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it; and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church; for instance, to the Catechism and to the Creeds. After learning from them the doctrines of Christianity, the inquirer must verify them by Scripture. One of the effects,*" adds Dr. Newman, "*of this view was to strike at the root of the principle on which the Bible Society was set up.*"

Hence, too, we read of the late Hurrell Froude, that—

“He professed openly his admiration of the Church of Rome, and his hatred of the Reformers; that he felt scorn of the maxim, ‘The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,’ and that he gloried in accepting tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching.”

Moreover, as Dr. Newman writes—

“What the members of the Bible Society did on the basis of Scripture we could do on the basis of the Church.”

From the same Church principles, and built upon the same foundations, Mr. Gladstone also derived the principle of authority—

“Divine authority to convey and to teach all fundamental truth, and a competency to bear witness, like any other living agent, to matters of fact, as inherent in the Church.”

Hence, though Mr. Gladstone, after his own fashion, appears to favour “the free circulation of the Holy Bible,” he maintains—

“The principle of Catholic consent as establishing the right interpretation of Scripture, and as the spiritual sanction of religious truth.”

Arguing, again, how inadequate a guarantee the profession of receiving the Holy Scriptures affords for the existence of anything like substantial Christianity in a Church, Mr. Gladstone says of the Unitarians—

“They do not receive the Sacred Writings in the sense of primitive and catholic Christianity, nor in connexion with the Church, whose office it is to preserve and to expound them, and by association with which we acquire the blessed privilege of being in a position to

learn and to digest them. We receive them illustrated by, and combined with, the general tone of Christian doctrine through all ages, knowing infallibly that there has always been a visible Church in possession of all fundamental truth, and therefore able to save the souls of men." "Tradition, indeed, is not a co-ordinate authority" with Scripture, "but it is a witness to the facts of the case;" for "the Church principle places Catholic tradition in competition, not with Scripture, but with private interpretations of Scripture."

It was this view of the Church's authority which aggravated the enormity of heresy and schism, as well in Mr. Gladstone's as in Dr. Newman's view. As, moreover, the Church had authority in matters of faith, so also had she authority in matters of discipline; and as Mr. Gladstone looked kindly on confession, penance, mortification, and prayers for the dead, so there can be no doubt that he also agreed with Dr. Newman in his approval of the monastic system, confraternities, celibacy, magnificent churches, gorgeous ceremonials and rituals, and special reverence for the Blessed Virgin.

On the other hand, Dr. Newman both disliked and distrusted Protestantism, because—

"It was not the profession of any religion at all, and was compatible with infidelity. What is called Evangelical Religion, or Puritanism, does but occupy the space between contending powers—Catholic Truth (Anglicanism) and Rationalism; and mere negatives could not withstand Liberalism."

Neither was Mr. Gladstone's estimate of Protestantism higher than Dr. Newman's; for he, too, regarded it as—

"Mere negation," and "as apt to degenerate into religious Liberalism, when it receives the first tinge of Latitudinarianism and *begins to join hands with Infidelity*, by superseding the belief of an immutable objective truth in religion necessary for salvation."

In truth, Rationalism was held to be the offspring of Protestantism and the parent of Liberalism. But the source and origin of Rationalism lay in the Protestant heresy of private judgment. And now we have arrived at the gist of this lengthy digression, Mr. Gladstone's theory of private judgment.

First of all, however, let us again revert to the "Apologia" to ascertain the views of the Tractarian party.

Dr. Newman thus unfolds not only his theory, but his method of arriving at the province of private judgment. Butler has laid it down that "probability is the guide of life." This teaching Dr. Newman improved by adding, that—

"That absolute certitude which we are able to possess, whether as to the truths of natural theology, or as to the fact of a revelation, is the result of an *assemblage* of concurring and converging probabilities; certitude is a habit of mind, certainty is a quality of propositions; probabilities which do not reach to logical certainty may create a mental certitude; the certitude thus created may equal in measure and strength the certitude which is created by the strictest scientific demonstration. Moreover, as there are probabilities which suffice to create certitude, so there are other probabilities which are legitimately adapted to create opinion. We are bound to be more or less sure in a sort of (as it were) graduated scale of assent; viz., according as the probabilities attaching to a professed fact were brought

home to us, and, as the case might be, to entertain about it a pious belief, or a pious opinion, or a religious conjecture, or, at least, a tolerance of such belief, or opinion, or conjecture in others, &c. *This is the region of private judgment in religion: that is, of a private judgment not formed arbitrarily and according to one's fancy or liking, but conscientiously and under a sense of duty.*"

Dr. Newman proceeds thus:—

"Speaking historically of what I held in 1843-44, I say that I believed in a God on a ground of probability, that I believed in Christianity on a probability, and that I believed in Catholicism on a probability, and that all three were about the same kind of probability, a cumulative, a transcendent probability, but still probability; inasmuch as He who made us has so willed that in mathematics, indeed, we arrive at certitude by rigid demonstration; but in religious inquiry we arrive at certitude by accumulated propositions."

Then he adds—

"And thus I came to see clearly, and to have a satisfaction in seeing, that, in being led on into the Church of Rome, I was proceeding, not by any secondary grounds of reason, or by controversial points in detail, but was protected and justified, even in the use of those secondary arguments, by a great and broad principle."

So much for Dr. Newman's theory of private judgment and its consequences.

Compare now with it what follows:—

"The so-called 'right of private judgment,'" according to Mr. Gladstone, "has two very opposite senses, in one of which it is a right, in the other a monstrous abuse. It is a right, on the part whether of nations or of individuals, as against human coercion, and it is also, of course, a duty of learning and apprehending *the truth*. It is a monstrous abuse when it is under-

stood to imply that the conscience of the individual is acquitted so soon as he has assented to some doctrinal system chosen at his pleasure, as coming from Scripture, constituting religion, when it is supposed to absolve him from the duty of being of one body and one spirit with the catholic Church of Christ."

I may here remark that this "so-called right of private judgment" is elsewhere identified with "liberty of conscience."

Mr. Gladstone's object, therefore, was to reconcile liberty of conscience with the authority of the Church, to uphold the unity of the latter, as well as freedom of assent, and "both as essential, but the latter as subservient." Hence he maintained that—

"Our Church never taught that men were free to frame any religion from Scripture which they pleased, or to form a diversity of communions. It is a mere fiction to say that the English Reformation was grounded on the doctrine of private judgment. It asserted merely this, that the nation was ecclesiastically independent, and this, not of Catholic consent, but of foreign authority."

Mr. Gladstone proceeded:—

"There is an irreconcilable hostility between this view of the rule of faith, the indubitable, the uniform doctrine of our great reformers, and the modern idea of private judgment, according to which it is a kind of impiety to suppose the intervention of any middle authority between the sacred Scriptures and a man's own mind. *A man is to ask himself the question, Does this appear so to me? But, where the matter has appeared differently to the universal Church, is he not also to ask himself the further question, Is it more probable that I or that they should be right? This law of probable evidence, then, we are called upon to examine, to appreciate, and to follow.*"

Accordingly, Mr. Gladstone's—

“Christian man, acting in the character of a judge upon his own religious belief, is bound to hear *tradition*, a witness to the facts of the case, and to judge, according to the balance of probabilities, whether it is not more likely to convey, in a disputed point, the mind of God, than his own single impressions.

“But in England the case was widely different from that of the Continent. Her Reformation did not destroy, but successfully maintained, the unity and succession of the Church in her apostolical ministry. *We have, therefore, still among us the ordained hereditary witnesses of the truth, conveying it to us through an unbroken series, from our Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles. This is to us the ordinary voice of authority; of authority equally reasonable and equally true, whether we will hear or whether we will forbear; of authority which does not supersede either the exercise of private judgment, or the sense of the Church at large, or the supremacy of the Scripture, but assists the first, locally applies the second, and publicly witnesses to the last. We may think the dictate of reason will be, that we should prefer adopting the quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, to our own conclusions from the sacred text when they are at issue with the catholic interpretation.*”

So much for Mr. Gladstone's theory in his first book.

Let us now look to his “Church Principles.” On pages 155 and 156 it is thus written:—

“The true doctrine of private judgment teaches the duty, and, as correlative to the duty, the right of a man to assent freely and rationally to the truth. It is commonly called a right to inquire; but it is to inquire for the purpose of assenting; for he has no right (that is, none before God) to reject the truth after his inquiry. It is a right to assent to truth, to inquire into alleged truth. Now, all that the true idea of the Church proposes to him is a probable and authorized guide. The Church of Eng-

land holds individual freedom in things spiritual to be an essential attribute of man's true nature, and an essential condition of the right reception of the Gospel; and testifies to that sentiment in the most emphatic modes, by encouraging the fullest communication of Scripture to the people. *Yet is it perfectly possible that the best use of such a freedom may often be thus exemplified; when a man, having prayed for light from God, and having striven to live in the spirit of his prayer, and yet finding his own opinion upon a point of doctrine opposite to that of the universal undivided Church, recognises the answer to his prayer, and the guide to his mind, in the declaration of the creeds, rather than in his own single and perhaps recent impressions upon the subject, not thus surrendering his own liberty of judgment, but using it in order to weigh and compare the probabilities of his or the Church's correctness respectively, and acting faithfully on the result."*

From such teaching does it not follow that the theory of private judgment held both by Dr. Newman and Mr. Gladstone was the same—the mere right of deciding between two probabilities; that is, of answering the question, Whether is it more probable that I or the Church is right? But, as the Church is to us—

“The ordinary voice of authority, of authority equally reasonable and equally true, whether we will hear or whether we will forbear,”

this theory of private judgment resolves itself simply into the right of assent to the Church. We may inquire, but only to agree with the Church, to verify, indeed, her doctrine. In fact, as Mr. Gladstone plainly stated, the best use of that freedom which he termed private judgment is when a man—

“Having prayed for light from God, and having striven to

live in the spirit of his prayer, and yet, finding his own opinion upon a point of doctrine "

opposite to that of the Church, forthwith recognises the answer to his prayer and the guide to his mind in the creeds rather than in his own impressions—

"Not thus surrendering his own liberty of judgment, but using it in order to weigh and compare the probabilities of his or the Church's correctness respectively, and acting faithfully on the result."

Anglicanism, or Tractarianism, therefore, according both to Dr. Newman and Mr. Gladstone, consisted in the absolute implicit reception of certain abstract, incomprehensible dogmas, whereof the first and principal was the existence of a visible, apostolic, catholic Church, possessed of infallible authority in matters of faith, and an unquestionable discretion in matters of discipline. These dogmas (that just mentioned, among the rest) were to be received with a man's whole assent and consent, simply because they were taught by that visible, apostolic, catholic Church.

Dr. Newman taught that—

"The sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church. After learning from them the doctrines of Christianity, the inquirer must verify them by Scripture."

Mr. Gladstone professed—

"To hold the one objective, permanent, unchangeable truth of religion ; a thing given to us and not discovered, not even dis-

covered from Scripture, by us ; and given to us, moreover, in the form of a visible, known, conspicuous, public institution."

But, to smooth the way to the reception of an implicit belief in inscrutable dogmas on the authority of the Church, the Tractarian system supplied the following opiate. It could not be denied that the theory of probabilities involved its own devotees in many intellectual and even theological difficulties, and that, to those who did not implicitly receive that dogma, those difficulties appeared insuperable. Here, however, we find a solution :—

"Many persons," says Dr. Newman, "are very sensitive of the difficulties of religion : I am as sensitive as any one ; but I have never been able to see a connexion between apprehending those difficulties, however keenly, and multiplying them to any extent, and doubting the doctrine to which they are attached. *Ten thousand difficulties do not make one doubt, as I understand the subject ; difficulty and doubt are incommensurate. A man may be annoyed that he cannot work out a mathematical problem, of which the answer is or is not given to him, without doubting that it admits of an answer, or that a particular answer is the true one.*"

Similarly, when insisting that to submit our private judgment to the voice of the Church is not to surrender freedom of conscience, Mr. Gladstone proceeds thus :—

"*I give a free assent to the propositions of Euclid ; and yet there is no room for doubt upon them, and it would be an offence against the laws of reason to come to any conclusion but one. Yet that conclusion may be perfectly free. Freedom is opposed to force, not to certainty nor to unity.*"

In other words, as Dr. Newman put it, Mr. Gladstone maintained that no difficulties intrinsic to a dogma ought to interfere with the free assent to be given to it, if vouched for by the authority of the Church. It might, and indeed ought to be believed, in that case, without doubt or hesitation, whatever difficulties there might be in comprehending it. Neither would that freedom of assent, according to Mr. Gladstone, be subjected to any coercion or force, any more than in assenting to a proposition of "Euclid," which could not, nevertheless, be worked out.

What, then, are the immediate consequences flowing out of this Tractarian theory, but more particularly from the doctrine of probabilities, in its bearing upon private judgment? Does it not exalt the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, as it is rhetorically styled, to an absolute, uncontrollable supremacy over the intellect, the reason, the will; nay, even over the conscience of man? Does it not imply still more—that the greater the sacrifice of man's intellect and reason, and will and conscience, before the shrine of the "unity and succession of the Church in her apostolical ministry—the ordained, hereditary witnesses of the truth"—the greater the merit, the worthier the penance, the holier the mortification?

Hence, I believe, the adder in Mr. Gladstone's path. As a religious principle, he was instructed at Oxford, or he trained himself, in the duty and necessity of bowing down before the image of what was represented

as quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus. To him the Church was the voice of authority, which claimed unquestioning, passive obedience. His faculties, therefore, of mind and soul relapsed into a state of dormant, servile subjection. If, indeed, his intellect, or reason, or will once quivered in resistance, straightway they were bidden to yield an humbler submission. The greater the difficulty to them, the better the offering of invincible faith. Thus the voice of reason and the voice of conscience—an artificial conscience—became not only distinct, but opposed. They gave forth not only different, but contrary sounds. But that free assent, of which Mr. Gladstone boasted, was in both cases a fiction and a delusion. At all events, it was but the free assent of blind bigotry and slavish superstition. Both reason and conscience, in fact, were under constraint, in a perpetual state of duress; for both were prostrate before the altar of deified dogmas. In truth, therefore, violence was done to both reason and conscience. And the proof as well as the results of that compulsion have been seen in Mr. Gladstone's chequered career, as well as in that of other Tractarians. Of all living men, he has, perhaps, done cruellest despite both to reason and to conscience. But the cause was this, that, in abject submission to a sectarian theory, he first compelled both his reason and conscience to an unconditional surrender. Having thus trained his best faculties to obey rather than to guide and govern, they have ever since done suit and service to his will,

until, instead of directing him aright, they not unfrequently impel him onwards to that which natural reason and conscience, if they had never been tampered with, would infallibly teach ought to be shunned. Hence it is that Mr. Gladstone goes wrong, not in spite of, but by reason of, his conscience. But no man is more capable of mischief than he who conscientiously acts upon erroneous principles. What retribution, however, more just than, when the supremacy of conscience has been wilfully and systematically compromised, for conscience herself to become a man's own evil genius?

As to the practical effects of the Tractarian theory of private judgment, and submitting it to the authority of the Church, on the basis of probabilities, in what do they differ from those of infallibility, as taught by Rome? Dr. Newman, indeed, assures us that, by this doctrine of probabilities, he was led on into the Church of Rome, "under cover of a great and broad principle." He also informs us that—

"He had no difficulty in believing the doctrine of Transubstantiation as soon as he believed that the Catholic Roman Church was the oracle of God, and that she had declared this doctrine to be part of the original revelation."

And Mr. Gladstone—

"Knew infallibly that there has always been a visible Church in possession of all fundamental truth, and therefore able to save the souls of men."

But suppose we take an illustration already quoted. Judge, then, the theory of probabilities by the following case from Froude's "Remains:"—

*"It appears to be plain that, in all matters which seem to us indifferent, or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church, which has preserved its traditional practices unknown. We cannot know, about any seeming indifferent practice of the Church of Rome, that it is not a development of the Apostolic *Æras*, and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the first six centuries; they must find a disproof, if they would do anything."*

I ask, then, what more could infallibility itself claim or wish than the rigid application of Mr. Gladstone's theory, and Mr. Froude's illustration, and Dr. Newman's example, of the doctrine of probabilities and private judgment?

It is not a part of my design to confute Mr. Gladstone's theories further than by exposing them; but I may be allowed, perhaps, to point out what seems to me the very climax of license in his dogma of private judgment. That teaching, he alleges—

"Constitutes, in fact, a simple exhibition of the Apostolic precept addressed to the believers of Thessalonica in the mass: '*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*'"

On another occasion he says—

"We adopt, then, in connexion, these great principles, the unity of the Church, and of the faith whereof the Church is a part, and the free subjection of that faith to private scrutiny. It is true that their junction looks like paradox; but it is the paradox of St. Paul."

In two other passages he reiterates kindred sentiments; and, after referring in a foot-note to 1 Thess. v. 21, adds, "Compare 1 John iv. 1." Now, in both these passages, the same word, *δοκιμάζετε*, is used in the original; but in the former it is construed "*prove*," and in the latter "*try*"—"try the spirits." This is a primary meaning of the word, and, I may add, the meaning given to it by Parkhurst in both the passages; for *to prove* and *to try* are manifestly identical. But what was Mr. Gladstone's plan? First of all he misinterpreted both the Greek and the English, both the word *δοκιμάζειν* and the word *prove*. Arbitrarily and intentionally he assigned to the former the secondary sense of *approving*, which is equally repugnant to the true meaning of the English word. With Mr. Gladstone, the right of private judgment was the right of *inquiring for the purpose of assenting*—that is, the right of proving or trying, only for the purpose of approving. But, secondly, Mr. Gladstone bids us "*compare*" the passage in Thessalonians, where he makes *δοκιμάζειν* mean *approve*, with one in St. John's Epistles, where it is construed *try*. What comparison, however, can there be in the case? There is a *contrast*, certainly, and it is Mr. Gladstone's; for both the Greek and the English translation admit of comparison. It appears, then, that, in connexion with this one text, Mr. Gladstone practised at least two tricks of literary legerdemain. His theory requiring some Scriptural warrant, he first assumed that *δοκιμάζειν* and *prove* meant to *approve*; then, that

he might not seem to rely upon merely one text, he implied that in St. John's Epistles a similar meaning occurred. The truth, however, is, that in neither passage does *δοκιμάζω* mean to *approve*, but to *try*, and to *try by the light of reason and Scripture, as reasonable and responsible creatures, and to act upon the results of that trial, whether to approve or to disapprove*. Yet, I find Mr. Gladstone appealing no less than four times to the text "*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good*," as though it thoroughly and completely established his theory of private judgment. Nay, he hesitates not to affirm that, though his theory looked like paradox, *it was the paradox of St. Paul*. The simple, literal truth, however, is this, that that very text, rightly understood, either in the Greek or English, wholly upsets Mr. Gladstone's theory, and not only proves exactly the reverse, but that what was imputed to St. Paul as a paradox, was a heresy of his own, or of Dr. Newman's engendering.

Reverting, now, to Parliamentary history, Mr. Gladstone's chief performance in 1839 consisted of his extraordinary speech in opposition to the proposed grant of £30,000 for education under the Lancaster system. Previous, however, to his rising, Mr. C. Buller had taken occasion thus to criticise the work we have briefly analyzed :—

"Mr. C. Buller wished to direct the attention of the House to the political tenets which had been put forward by his hon. friend opposite (Mr. Gladstone), of whom he would not speak without congratulating him on having been one of the few men in the present

day who ventured not only to put forward unpopular tenets, but followed them to their legitimate consequences, with a logical intrepidity as rare and almost as admirable as his moral courage. He would ask the House to recollect his hon. friend's arguments for what was a system of religious favouritism, if not of religious intolerance, and whether there was more than one logical step between these doctrines and religious persecution. His hon. friend's arguments went to the root of the great bulwark of Protestantism—the right of free inquiry and of private judgment—and he wished to know whether, upon the exquisite reasoning of his hon. friend, *they would allow the right of private judgment to dwindle into the right of simply agreeing with the Church of England in everything she proposed.* He asked them, the guardians of the liberties as well as of the religion of the people of England, to look well to those doctrines, *so fatal to freedom and to Protestantism,* which were making rapid and dangerous progress. And if the arguments which he had previously used were not sufficient to induce them to refrain from placing education under the superintendence of the Established Church, at least, before they did so, let the considerations which he had last adduced induce them to require a guarantee that their placing the education of the country in those hands would not favour *the propagation of doctrines than which the Papacy, in its worst days, never advanced anything more degrading to the human mind, and more inconsistent with human liberty.*"

This opinion, it will be seen, corresponds entirely with the tone of Macaulay's Review in the "Edinburgh," especially on Mr. Gladstone's theory of private judgment. In reply, the author of those "unpopular tenets" thus spoke:—

"The noble lord opposite had alluded to a book of his, and had also taunted him with what he was pleased to denominate the result of his principles. He was not afraid of entering into

a discussion with the noble lord (J. Russell) upon those principles *He would not flinch from a word which he had uttered, or from a single syllable which he had written upon religious topics.* All that he should say in reply was this, that if the hon. member for Liskeard (Mr. C. Buller) was justified in asserting that his doctrines on the right of private judgment resolved themselves into the necessity of conforming to the doctrines of the Church of England, and led, if pushed a step further, to persecution, he was also justified in asserting that the doctrines of the hon. member for Liskeard destroyed the means of discerning between truth and falsehood, and led, if carried out to their next stage, to nothing less than national infidelity.

“The proposition which he intended to maintain was, that what the State had been doing, in giving grants to the British and Foreign Society, was a mere limitation of the principle for which the hon. gentleman opposite contended, and that the State had never yet recognised the principle of teaching all forms of religion indifferently, and of placing truth and falsehood on a footing of equality. Before the House was called upon to act upon this principle, and advance in a direction so different from that in which the whole previous legislation of the country had run, he again begged that the grounds of the proceeding should be clearly avowed, and that some intimation should be given of the results at which it was intended they should finally arrive, *in order that they should not be required to embark on an ocean of political change without knowing the haven for which they were bound.*

“*If the State was to be regarded as having no other function than that of representing the mere will of the people as to religious tenets, he admitted the truth of the principle that, ‘as long as the State continues to employ Roman Catholic sinews, and to finger Unitarian gold, it cannot refuse to extend to those by whom it so profits the blessings of education;’ but if they were to hold, as he felt himself obliged to hold, that the State was capable of duties, that the State could have a conscience (laughter), would the hon. member (Mr. J. Wood) have the goodness to tell him*

how the principle of duty could be applicable where that of conscience was not?

“What was the predicament of Government? To what were they bringing the country? (Lord J. Russell: At least, not to bigotry and intolerance.) The noble lord would have been accurate if he had said, to latitudinarianism and atheism. The predicament of ministers appeared to him to be that of men who lived from day to day by shifts and expedients, men who used arguments the real tendency of which they were unable to perceive. Right hon. gentlemen and noble lords opposite came forward with plausible allegations respecting the general benefits of education, with allusions to cases of destitution, with exaggerated statements of deficiencies, and depreciating statements of the exertions of the Church, in support of a measure which had for its first consequence, indeed, to supply the people with education, but for its ultimate consequence, as he firmly believed, to destroy the principles on which the religion of the State was founded, and with them that national character which had hitherto been the boast of England. The noble lord opposite would consent to learn nothing from his attacks on the religion of the country. It might have been sufficient for the noble lord to look back to the experience of the last three years. The noble lord had produced on the minds of the people the impression that his measures were hostile to the religion of the country; but, year after year, he persisted in bringing forward fresh plans, from every one of which he was obliged to desist, baffled, defeated, and trampled down. *Ministers were not satisfied with bringing forward a plan of appropriation of Irish Church property, which they could not carry—a plan for loading the Church lands with the Church Rates in England, which they were forced to abandon: they must choose another point of attack, and, by means equally insidious and fatal, seek to undermine what they could not storm.*”

It would be but bad taste to spoil the effect of Mr. Gladstone's picture by any comment of my own. I

shall, therefore, only remark that, among the ministers so vigorously denounced in 1839, are two of Mr. Gladstone's present colleagues, Lord Palmerston and Earl Russell.

With respect to Mr. Gladstone's main argument, if it need any further explanation, I commend to the reader's attention the following remarks from "The State in its Relations with the Church :"—

"Not contented with excluding religion from the province of government, the spirit of the age struggles with no less zeal to introduce, as its substitute, education; that is to say, the cultivation of the natural man, instead of the heart and affections of the spiritual man—the abiding in the life of Adam, instead of passing into the life of Christ. But what we would mark is, by what subtle gradations popular opinion is deviating further and further from the truth, in the highest of all matters which belong to political societies. The old notion was that religion was their salt, and, in a prudential view, their only effective guarantee, as well as a duty of imperative obligation flowing out of the personality of nations, and out of the individual composition of governments. But the modern notion is, first, that the governor is not competent to exercise a preference in religion, for the nation or any part of it; and next, that a matter in which he is not competent to discriminate, manifestly cannot be in any way *essential* to the well-being of societies, or he who is concerned for them must, according to his opportunities, be concerned for it. The advocates of this theory of education often deprecate, in words, a mere naked intellectualism. They talk much of moral culture, and assume that it can be sufficiently and generally had without religion. Or, perhaps, they are shocked at the idea of surrendering religion, and they profess that religion consists in certain habits of mind, entirely apart from dogma; that, while they exclude dogma, they would care-

fully include religion. But all these forms of profession come to the same thing. Once cast off allegiance to the revealed truth of God—once assume the function of dispensing with such portions of it as carnal wit here or there does not appreciate; once reject the *means* which God, in His mercy, has provided by revelation, and the attempt to attain the end will inevitably fail. Do we flatter ourselves that, if we deem this method impracticable, we shall succeed in our own? *But the point upon which we have to fix our attention is this: there is a strong disposition to overthrow the principle of an Established Church, and therein ultimately to deny that religion is the great sanction of civil society. There is a contemporaneous disposition among us, entertained almost exclusively by the very same persons, to substitute an universal education or general culture, at the expense of the State, for the universal spiritual culture of the Church. The former is to be the substitute for the latter. It is intended fundamentally to change the structure of society, and the one thing needful for its well-being is to be this general culture. The mark of tyranny is upon it even while the theory is young: it is to be compulsory. This, I suppose, is thought the only way in which the energies of the Church can be effectually quelled. But what insanity is this labouring at a moral Babel, which will not only confound, but crush and grind into the very dust its framers !”*

Perhaps I owe an apology for this lengthy extract; but, besides expressing Mr. Gladstone’s views, from 1838 to 1841, upon education, it may possibly suggest that he has missed his right vocation. However, his volume contains several more excellent discourses even than that.

It only remains to append some remarks of the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Spring Rice) upon Mr. Gladstone and his views. Macaulay wrote—

“It would not be at all strange if Mr. Gladstone were one of the most unpopular men in England.”

Mr. C. Buller also commented upon his “unpopular tenets.” It will be found that Mr. Spring Rice alluded to the same feature in Mr. Gladstone’s views. He said—

“Differing as I do from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone), I differ from him with the most entire respect, because I am perfectly sure that, whether as an author or as a Member of Parliament, no individual comes forward with more frank avowals of what he believes to be the truth; no one places his belief on a higher or firmer basis; and I believe no one is more ready to expose himself to obloquy, if it were necessary, in maintaining his own honest opinions. But the hon. gentleman must permit me to say, with equal frankness and freedom, that the principles he has laid down, however consolatory to his own conscience, and however consistent with his theory of the constitution, are, in my judgment, *not only inconsistent with the true constitution of England—not only unsatisfactory to the conscience of others—but are inconsistent with all notions of civil and religious freedom.*”

In 1840, one of the most important measures of the session, whether we regard the principle involved, or Mr. Gladstone’s tactics in reference to the subject, was the Clergy Reserves (Canada) Bill. The following explanations were offered on the second reading:—

“Lord J. Russell said, The hon. gentlemen who opposed this Bill, all seemed to have argued on the ground that it was a Bill to explain the Act of 1791. That was not the object of the present Bill, but to settle the question, which had been a source of great discontent and vexation in Canada. The Act of 1791

had a certain sense to be applied to it, and with regard to that sense certain doubts had arisen, and the matter had been referred to the judges for their opinion. But the present Bill was not a Bill to explain any of those doubts, or to state what were the opinions of the Legislature in 1791. It was a Bill proposing to deal with property as it now existed, and to settle it in the manner best calculated for the peace of Canada, and for the promotion of religious instruction there. It was thought desirable, then, not to explain the Act of 1791, but to settle the question in such a manner as to promote the religious instruction of the people, and procure the permanent settlement of the dispute. The object was to effect a settlement by sale, and such a settlement as, by proving satisfactory, was likely to be permanent."

Mr. Gladstone, however, argued thus :—

"They were not about to settle the abstract principle of a Church Establishment, but to deal with a difficulty which had arisen out of the Act of 1791; and *he would not be a party to a violent and compulsory abrogation of any claims which had arisen under the Act of 1791*; and, if he took the explanation of the noble lord as the principle of the Bill, he inferred it to be a measure based upon an unlimited right to alienate what had been solemnly given, and which it was not pretended had been abused. He would not, however, vote against the second reading. Such a compulsory abrogation would be neither more nor less than a breach of faith.

"What was the principle of this Bill? It might fairly be inferred from its title and preamble. The Bill was entitled, 'A Bill to provide for the Sale of the Clergy Reserves in the Province of Upper Canada, and for the Distribution of the Proceeds thereof.' No friend of the Church could fail to be aware that the sale of these reserves, at least to a considerable extent, would be wise and judicious; and then, as to the distribution of the proceeds, that was the very thing that was contemplated by the Act of

1791, although it had never taken effect. The noble lord spoke of the Bill as an unsettlement of the Act of 1791, and a re-settlement of the whole question on a totally different footing; but the preamble merely declared it to be '*expedient to provide for the final disposition of the lands called Clergy Reserves in the Province of Upper Canada, and for the appropriation of the yearly income arising or to arise therefrom, for the maintenance of religion and the advancement of Christian knowledge within the said province;*' which strictly and literally did not call for any expression of hostility on the second reading of this Bill."

Accordingly, though with reluctance, Mr. Gladstone supported the Bill of 1840, upon the express understanding that it was carrying out the provisions of the Act of 1791. What, then, were those provisions? Let Mr. Gladstone's book reply:—

"By the Constitutional Act of 1791, in conformity with the tenor of ancient instructions to governors to make provision everywhere for the worship of the Church, one seventh part of all wild lands were directed to be set apart, under the title of Clergy Reserves, as settlements should extend. As they were found to remain uncultivated, a power has been taken of selling them and holding the proceeds for the benefit, according to the terms of the Act of 1791, of a Protestant Clergy. There has been much controversy upon the question whether this phrase includes the Clergy of the Church of Scotland. In conformity with an opinion given by the law officers of the Crown at home, in the year 1819, it has of late been held that they are so included."

And in the fourth edition of that work, which appeared in 1841, "revised and enlarged," Mr. Gladstone commented on the Bill of 1840 in these terms:—

"The measure became law with the general concurrence of all parties. In my opinion it was just that the State should refuse

to cancel any of the equitable or inchoate rights which could be shown to have arisen under the Act of 1791 without the consent of parties; and it was wise that those who are specially entitled to act for the Colonial Church should purchase a clear definition and a full legal settlement, as well as relief from most painful contentions, by agreeing to forego a portion of what, even if real, was undefined, and incapable of strict definition. *That the colony should have desired this surrender, of course I must consider a circumstance most unfortunate for its permanent well-being."*

In what way those high-toned sentiments were subsequently hushed will appear in due time. Here I shall only add, that the second reading of the Clergy Reserves (Canada) Bill of 1840, ultimately carried in the shape cut out by Lord J. Russell himself, was opposed by Sir H. Inglis, Mr. Estcourt, Sir S. Glynne, Mr. Plumptre, and others with whom Mr. Gladstone was in the habit of voting and speaking, and that, up to 1841 inclusive, this is the only occasion, I believe, on which Mr. Gladstone and those "stern, unbending Tories" alluded to by Macaulay, took different sides.

Another proposition of 1840, upon which Mr. Gladstone "took action," was the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill, a measure, without doubt, springing out of Sir R. Peel's policy. The second reading of this Bill was carried by 87 to 11, Sir R. Peel voting with the majority, Mr. Gladstone being absent, and his Tory friends, Sir. H. Inglis, Sir. S. Glynne, and Colonel Sibthorp, leading the Opposition. On going into Committee, however, Mr. Gladstone could no longer refrain

himself; but, Mr. Pusey having proposed an amendment to the effect that further information was desirable relative to the cathedral establishments, he thus spoke:—

“In a question of this kind he thought he was bound to look to the Bishops of the Church. He believed that he was correct in stating that the Primate of England and the Bishop of London were the two individuals most responsible for the provisions of this Bill. There were five Bishops in the commission; but of them it was pretty well understood that three were not disposed to consent to the recommendations; and as to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, their recommendations had been somewhat diminished by circumstances. *He should like to know whether the opinions expressed in those recommendations had or had not been maintained by them all their lives, or whether they had been suddenly adopted.* He objected to the Bill because it gave a shock to property; secondly, because it would not remedy the abuses of cathedrals; and, thirdly, because it would frustrate the very object for which it was introduced. Men had been allowed to bequeath their property for these purposes, and these bequests ought not to be interfered with on the mere pretence of general improvement. He thought they had no right to violate the wills of founders of cathedrals. He believed that the object of the noble lord might be carried into effect consistently with the wills of founders of cathedrals; and it was contrary to all reason, and to the rule of law respecting bequests, to violate the wills of founders when we could gain the object by respecting them.”

Would Mr. Gladstone like the same measure meted out to himself which he dealt out to the Bishops in 1840?

“He should like to know,” forsooth, “whether the opinions expressed in those recommendations had or had not been main-

tained by them all their lives, or whether they had been suddenly adopted!"

Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est.

Mr. Pusey's amendment, I may add, was lost by 117 to 48, Sir R. Peel being absent; but Mr. Gladstone, along with his faithful trio, Sir H. Inglis, Sir S. Glynne, and Colonel Sibthorp, voted with the majority. Neither did their hostility spend itself in Committee. On the third reading of the Bill, though no division took place, the following farewell salutes were fired:—

"Mr. Gladstone said, The main objection urged by the opponents of this Bill had been that it would place the ecclesiastical establishment of the country upon an insecure and precarious foundation, and that the present measure seemed only intended to prepare them for further measures of reduction of the property of the Church, and to invite them by degrees to plans of entire spoliation."

"Colonel Sibthorp hoped that there was still strength left among those connected with the Church to reject this measure. Until her Majesty's Government, which was a disgrace to the country, was changed, there would be no hope for the preservation of the Church."

The year 1841 saw another attempt, on the part of Mr. Divett, to modify at least the civil disabilities of the Jews, by admitting them to corporate offices. Sir H. Inglis having spoken against the motion, on its first reading, to the effect that—

"He did not object to the motion on any personal ground, but he did so on the ground that, by their constantly giving these

little concessions, they were gradually leading to great and serious changes. He was sorry to say that this system had long been pursued in that House, and which, if continued, he feared would ultimately lead to the greatest evils."

"Mr. Gladstone said that it appeared to him that the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Warburton) was the best justification which could have been pronounced, for the course which had been pursued by his hon. friend the member for Oxford University (Sir H. Inglis). He understood his hon. friend to say, in effect, that this motion was not to be considered so much in respect to its intrinsic value as to what it might hereafter lead to. *This was an important question, because upon it rested the point whether the Jews should or should not sit in Parliament.* He believed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Divett) would find that there was a large amount of objection to this principle. He had no disposition to press upon individuals, but it was matter for consideration, at the same time, whether they should admit Jews into a Christian House of Legislature."

No division, however, was taken on that occasion; but, on the second reading, which was carried by 137 to 24, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Estcourt voted in the minority, Sir H. Inglis and Mr. C. Bruce being the tellers, whilst Sir R. Peel was absent. Subsequently, on the third reading—

"Mr. Gladstone rose, pursuant to the notice he had given, to move, as an amendment, that it be read a third time that day six months. *If it was possible to draw a broad line of principle between a Bill to admit Jews to municipal offices, and one to permit them to hold other offices, including seats in Parliament, the subject would be different from that which they had now to discuss;* but he was satisfied that such a line could not be drawn; and the advocates of this measure must, to be consistent, follow it up with another, throwing open to Jews seats in Parliament, and all other offices which might be held by Christians.

“His reason for opposing the Bill was this: that the profession of the Jews was of itself in the nature of a disqualification for legislative office in a country where Christianity was interwoven with the institutions of the State. *The question, then, really before the House, as it appeared to him, was this, whether they would consent to destroy the distinctive Christianity of the Constitution. He had heard much sneering on a former occasion at an expression used by his hon. friend the member for the University of Oxford (Sir H. Inglis), namely, that they were about to unchristianize England by this Bill.* When his hon. friend used this expression he knew that an attempt would be made to put a misconstruction on his meaning; but his hon. friend did not conceive that he could use a more appropriate term, or one more approximating even to the nature of a truism with regard to this subject. *The test for office was at present a Christian test—this test the Bill meant to remove and to amend. Was not this to unchristianize?*

“It was said, however, that the State had admitted Dissenters and Roman Catholics to office, and some said that it was not worth while to exclude the Jews. Others said, ‘We have admitted the one class, and in common courtesy should admit the other.’ That he begged leave to deny. The proposition was a very different one from those which were made when the claims of the Catholics and Dissenters were before Parliament. Parliament was then told, and to a great extent reasonably, that a bond of common Christianity united them all together. He well remembered a most interesting passage in a speech delivered by Sir G. Murray, who spoke of the sympathy which had existed in the campaigns in which he had taken a part, between his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects and himself, and alluded to the common bond of a belief in the same redemption. But these were sentiments which were totally inapplicable to the consideration of the present question. He need not trouble the House much further. In his mind the Constitution would be much better served and preserved by this limitation in the power of holding offices, to Christians, than by admitting Jews.

"There had been days, and they might recur, when the Parliament of England was called on to exercise functions still more directly ecclesiastical than of late had fallen to their lot. He admitted that the present House was, to a certain extent, disqualified by diversity of religious profession from discussing such questions as these. He did not complain of this change in the constitution of the House. He admitted that it had lost a portion of its competency to discuss these questions, but that competency must necessarily be regulated by circumstances; and the circumstance of their having incorporated with them very many persons differing with them in religious opinions, would make it unreasonable, even if it were possible, to retain the same authority over the Church. *The more of her opponents, however, they introduced into Parliament, it was manifest that the more did they increase their incompetence. The time might come when the admixture of creeds amongst them would be so strange and particoloured that it would be an insult to public opinion to think of discharging ecclesiastical functions. In introducing these men, therefore, to Parliament and to high offices, there existed an absolute tendency to disqualify Parliament from the performance of any duties connected with religion, and therefore, by an easy transition, to overturn the very principles upon which the national religion was based. The further these changes were extended, the more difficult would it be to do that which in ancient times the House of Commons and the Crown had combined to accomplish; and in all such measures as this he contended that there was largely mixed up the danger of subverting the whole superstructure of the established religion.*"

Startling as are those statements, their full significance will not appear except by contrast with what follows in 1845 and 1847. Meanwhile, I hasten to note that Sir R. Peel was again absent on the third reading of Mr. Divett's Bill, as well as on the second; that the tellers for the minority, 31 in number, were Mr. Gladstone

and Sir H. Inglis; and that they were supported, among others, by Mr. Estcourt, Sir S. Glynne, and Colonels Perceval and Sibthorp.

The only other event of 1841 bearing immediately upon our subject was the return of Sir R. Peel to office in August, after the General Election, with a majority in the House of Commons of some 90 votes. Notwithstanding the contrast in their votes and speeches—a contrast considerably magnified during the four years preceding—Mr. Gladstone resumed office under the Conservative chief, having been appointed Vice-President of the Board of Trade.

The Conservative reaction of 1841 was too palpable a fact to be doubted. At length the waves of the Reform agitation, which had surged to and fro during the preceding decade, had fairly subsided. In a previous work I endeavoured to sum up the general results of that epoch, with special reference to their effect upon the union of Church and State. Here, therefore, I shall only remark that it was, nevertheless, in the year 1841 that the Anti-State Church agitation entered upon a new era—an era inaugurated under the joint auspices of Mr. Miall and Mr. Bright. Towards the consummation, however, of that policy it seems not improbable that Mr. Gladstone, the most fearless champion, up to 1842, of the exclusive system of Church and State connexion, will render the most effective services—services, at all events, deemed the most effective by the Anti-State Church party.

This Chapter I shall conclude with a brief review of the main points introduced. That Mr. Gladstone began public life as a Tory is but an inference from his return for Newark in 1832. That his Tory predilections were only confirmed and strengthened by his parliamentary experience up to 1842, is partly proved by his views on the Maynooth Grant, which he first supported and then opposed, and partly by the general tenor of his speeches, books, and votes. It was in 1838, however, that he reached the zenith of Toryism, continuing at that point (*mirabile dictu*) for some four years. On every division, with only one exception, I believe, between 1832 and 1842, Mr. Gladstone voted uniformly, not with Sir R. Peel and the Conservatives, but with Sir H. Inglis and the Tories. Dr. Newman, indeed, informs us that Mr. Keble and Mr. H. Froude, as well as himself, supported Sir H. Inglis and opposed Sir R. Peel in 1829 at Oxford, in addition to other reasons, because they disliked his change of policy, as dictated by Liberalism. And Mr. Gladstone stated, in his first work, that—

“There can be no support of a national Church, on the ground of a conscientious adherence, by a State in which Liberalism shall have worked out its will.”

Hence, to steer wholly clear of Liberalism, Mr. Gladstone took a Tory, not a Conservative, compass on board. If not, indeed, the chief of the Tory party, between 1832 and 1842, he was at least the most hopeful of its

leaders. If not Jupiter, he aimed apparently at taking the part of Mercury.

Moreover, as his published works prove that he was a High Tory in theory, so his votes and speeches in the House of Commons show that he aimed consistently and persistently to carry out that theory in practical legislation, to all its consequences. This will be evident by comparing Mr. Gladstone's parliamentary action on the Universities, the Irish Church, Church Rates, the Prisons Bill, Maynooth Grant, National Education, the Canada Clergy Reserves, and on Jewish Disabilities, with the sentiments contained in his book on the same subjects. Up to 1842, therefore, it may safely be concluded that Mr. Gladstone was a Tory of the first water, not only in principle, but in practice, and as much in action as in theory.

His Tory principles in civil matters, however, appear to have been merely the complement of his religious opinions. His earliest and deepest impressions were of a religious or ecclesiastical order. To all appearances he was just as rank a Tractarian as Dr. Newman, up to 1842. I believe, therefore, that his political theories were suggested and certainly confirmed by his religious views. He himself has admitted, indeed, with respect to "certain existing phenomena indicative of evil," that—

"All this we have ascribed, I believe, with strict truth, to the principle of religious Liberalism into which Protestantism is apt to degenerate. But there is a parallel and concurrent action of political Liberalism which aids in producing the same results."

As, then, Tractarianism had to wage war against religious Liberalism, so Toryism had to do battle with political Liberalism. But it was the former that coloured the latter, in Mr. Gladstone's case, up to 1842.

With respect to minor matters, I may note that no public career was ever begun under more promising auspices than Mr. Gladstone's. At 23 years of age he was returned for a borough where his seat depended simply upon consistent conduct. At 25 years of age, in the year 1834, he was elected to a high position in Government. In 1841 he was again chosen, and to fill a more prominent place. But the angry paroxysms of 1835-37 and -39 show that the virtue of equanimity and moderation was never any part of his character. As Macaulay said in 1839—

“There is no want of light, but a great want of what Bacon would have called dry light. Whatever Mr. Gladstone sees is refracted and distorted by a false medium of passions and prejudices.”

With respect, again, to the matter of his books and speeches, Mr. Gladstone's fondness for the abstract par-took, from the first, of the nature of a monomania. On this head Macaulay is again a witness:—

“He (Mr. Gladstone) first resolves on his conclusion. He then makes a major proposition of most comprehensive dimensions, and, having satisfied himself that it contains his conclusion, never troubles himself about what else it may contain. And, as soon as we examine it, we find that it contains an infinite number of conclusions, every one of which is a monstrous absurdity.”

Already, indeed, I have remarked that Mr. Gladstone's theory of Church and State relations actually involved, among other things, the principle upon which the Liberation Society justifies the confiscation and secularization of Church property.

In conclusion, I may intimate that, however true at the time, and up to 1842, Macaulay's description of Mr. Gladstone, in 1839, as—

“The rising hope of those stern and unbending Tories who follow, reluctantly and mutinously, a leader whose experience and eloquence are indispensable to them, but whose cautious temper and moderate opinions they abhor,”

was not prophetic.

CHAPTER II.
FROM 1842 TO 1846.



THE TRANSITION PERIOD.

It was in 1842 that Sir R. Peel initiated that great change in our financial system marked by the reduction or abolition of import duties upon articles of consumption, and also by the reimposition of the income tax. Required and granted at first merely as a temporary expedient, for the purpose of restoring an equilibrium between the national income and expenditure, this impost seems, under Mr. Gladstone's manipulation, not unlikely to prove the key-stone of a gigantic and universal system of direct taxation.

It may, therefore, well be that, owing to his devotion to commercial policy in his new post, Mr. Gladstone was chiefly occupied with other than constitutional questions during the years 1842 and 1843. It may

be, also, that, notwithstanding the combined operations of the Chartists and political Dissenters, recorded in another volume, the attacks upon the Constitution were neither frequent nor formidable. Or, again, it may be that Mr. Gladstone's Tory opinions had received a shock even from the first renewal of intercourse with Sir R. Peel in an official character, in 1841, and that, in consequence, he purposely abstained from speaking upon such motions as concerned the State in its relations with the Church. Be the reason what it may, Mr. Gladstone's parliamentary history, in 1842 and 1843, presents little to be remarked upon here.

As some indication, however, of the current of his opinions, I may refer to the Factory Acts Amendment Bill of 1843. A Government measure, it nevertheless contained some provisions on education far from being in accordance with Mr. Gladstone's views of 1839. Among others, the Church Catechism was not to be made an indispensable part of the system of teaching. This proposal, combined with the evident disposition of Government to make other concessions to Dissent, called forth a strong remonstrance from Sir H. Inglis on the second reading, though he declined to divide against the Bill :—

“On the part of those who constituted not only the majority of that House, but also the vast majority of the people of England, the members of the Church of England, *he claimed for the Established Church the maintenance of her office as the supreme instructress of the people of this country; and he main-*

tained that a system of national education could never be sound or firmly based, except upon the foundation of a national Church. The great objection of the members of the Church of England to the present Bill was that, to a great extent, although he admitted it applied only to the manufacturing districts of the country, it proceeded on principles which therefore might be extended at any time to the whole country, to place the Church of England in a position not so pre-eminent as that which, constitutionally, it maintained at present, and in which, from its inherent character, they would wish to see it."

These sentiments, it will be found, are identical with those expressed by Mr. Gladstone in 1839, and Mr. Gladstone himself seems to have felt some change either in his opinions or position. On no single occasion did he speak in favour of the Education Clauses of the Factory Act. As a Government measure he could hardly oppose it, and as the author of "The State in its Relations with the Church" he could not with good grace defend it. He was, therefore, silent.

It is, moreover, apparent from the "Life and Times of Sir J. Graham,"* that even in 1843 some changes were contemplated by Sir R. Peel's Government in respect to Irish Roman Catholics, but whether in regard to Maynooth only, or to the endowment of the Roman Catholic clergy, is uncertain. It may be, also, that, as Mr. Gladstone was not in the Cabinet till the autumn of this year, when he was elevated to the Presidentship of the Board of Trade, he had no knowledge of the

* Saunders, Otley, & Co.

facts mentioned in the work just referred to. But this much is certain, that, though both questions were mooted in July, in a debate on Mr. Smith O'Brien's motion on the state of Ireland, and although the Irish Church was also assailed in severe terms, Mr. Gladstone again pursued the policy of silence. It is a fair presumption, therefore, to infer that Mr. Gladstone's Toryism began to thaw, at least, in 1843. In 1844 we discern in overt acts the first portents of that marvellous change which, rapidly developed, was as rapidly followed out in action to its natural consequences, in 1845, though the consummation is not yet.

Government having introduced what is termed the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, Mr. Gladstone, on the second reading, defended the measure thus :—

“He was prepared to prove that, although the original founders of those meeting-houses might have been, and were, in the vast majority of instances, persons of Trinitarian opinions, yet, on the principles of justice, the present holders, being Unitarians, ought to be protected. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Plumptre) said this Bill was an insult to the Christian feeling of the country; but if the Bill be required by the principles of justice, then, so far from its being an insult to the Christian feelings of the people, it was a Bill which the Christian feelings of the people should require the Legislature to enact.

“He thought it was clear that, before the death of those who had first associated for the establishment of chapels, the belief in the Trinity had become an open question, and was not considered a test of religious belief. Those who looked into the history of the facts must be convinced that those foundations were made on the understanding that the body benefited should

be left to its unrestrained private judgment. The hon. member for Kent himself could not tell them they were passing a Bill for the encouragement of error. If there were a question as to the right to an estate between a pious man and a profligate, to which it was proved that the latter had the best title, would the hon. member be deterred from adjudging the estate to the rightful owner by being told that he would be encouraging error if he did so? Now, the duties of the judge in that case corresponded to those which the House was, on this occasion, called upon to perform. They were now called upon to adapt the law to the general principles of equity and justice. So far from feeling that there was any contrariety between his principles of religious belief and those on which legislation in this case ought to proceed, he said that the only use he could make of those principles was to apply them to the decisive performance of a great and important act; an act which, whether its consequences may be convenient or inconvenient—and he, for one, believed that the balance would be greatly on the side of convenience—was founded on the everlasting principles of truth and justice.”

I need hardly remark that, with the hon. member for Kent, here referred to, Mr. Gladstone, up to 1842, co-operated most cordially, or that the change was in Mr. Gladstone and not in Mr. Plumptre. Contrast, also, Mr. Gladstone’s advocacy of the Unitarians, in 1844, with the following remarks in his “State in its Relations with the Church:”—

“The *Regium Donum* is a gift annually voted in Parliament for the partial support of Presbyterian ministers in Ireland; and a portion of the participators are represented as holding Arian and Socinian doctrines. This being the case, it will in all probability be extensively confessed that the grant, were it at our free discretion, is unjustifiable; while in another point of view,

having been originally given to those who believed in the Holy Trinity, it serves to illustrate the difficulty in which governments entangle themselves when they covenant with arbitrary systems of opinion, and not with the Church alone. The opinion passes away, but the gift remains."

The second reading of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, I may add, was carried by 307 to 117 votes, the minority consisting mostly of those who ordinarily were Sir R. Peel's supporters, and including the whole of the Tory party. The tellers, indeed, for the Opposition were Sir H. Inglis and Mr. Plumptre; and Colonels Verner and Sibthorp, Lord Ashley, and Mr. Newdegate voted on the same side. In fact, this division distinctly marks a turning-point in Mr. Gladstone's career. From and after it, the separation between him and his old friends, those "stern, unbending Tories" of Macaulay, gradually widened, until, within a few years, though representatives of the same University, Sir H. Inglis and Mr. Gladstone, so far from uniformly voting and speaking together, as had been the case up to 1842, not only took opposite courses, but sat on opposite sides of the House of Commons. But we anticipate.

On the third reading of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, carried by 201 to 81, the tellers for the minority were Mr. J. C. Colquhoun and Sir H. Inglis; whilst Colonels Verner and Sibthorp, and Lord Ashley also figured in opposition. Mr. Gladstone again voted in the majority; but Sir S. Glynne was absent, as well on the third as on the second reading. One of the principal provisions, it

may be observed, of this Bill was to secure to all congregations the undisturbed enjoyment of such chapels or charities as had been held by them for 25 years of continuous possession, whatever their tenets.

As some proof that a change had come over Mr. Gladstone, and that his speech on the second reading of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill was an indication of that change, I here append some remarks of Mr. Sheil, who rose next after Mr. Gladstone, and said—

“I am delighted to hear from such high authority that this Bill is perfectly reconcilable with the strictest and the sternest principles of State conscience. *I cannot doubt that the right hon. gentleman, the champion of free trade, will ere long become the advocate of the most unrestricted liberty of thought.* It is very much to be regretted that the arguments which he has pressed upon the House to-night were not urged in Lady Hewley's case; for, if they had been pressed with the clearness, the force, and the irresistible historical evidence which he has adduced in such powerful array, I cannot help thinking that the decision in Lady Hewley's case would have been different.”

On Mr. Ward resuscitating in the same year the old question of the Appropriation Clause, by a motion “that this House do resolve itself into a Committee upon the present state of the Temporalities of the Church of Ireland,” which was negatived by 274 to 179, Mr. Gladstone again maintained a *minax silentium*. That silence, however, may be better estimated on referring back to his speeches in 1833 and 1835 on the Irish Church. But the following extract from his work on “Church and State” may also help to heighten

the contrast between Mr. Gladstone up to 1842 and within two years subsequent. Here is the view of the Irish Church taken by Mr. Gladstone as a Tory :—

“Nor need our opponents go far for a case in exemplification of their propositions. Upon us of this day has fallen (and we shrink not from it, but welcome it as a high and glorious, though an arduous duty) the defence of the reformed Catholic Church in Ireland, as the religious establishment of the country. The Protestant Legislature of the empire maintain in the possession of the Church property of Ireland the ministers of a creed professed by one ninth of its population, regarded with partial favour by scarcely another ninth, and disowned by the remaining seven. But, however formidable at first sight these admissions may appear, they in no way shake the foregoing arguments. They do not change the nature of truth, and her capability and destiny to benefit mankind. They do not relieve Government of its responsibility. It is undoubtedly competent, in a constitutional view, to the Government of this country to continue the present disposition of Church property in Ireland. It appears not too much to assume that our Imperial Legislature has been qualified to take, and has taken, in point of fact, a sounder view of religious truth than the majority of the people of Ireland in their destitute and uninstructed state. We believe, accordingly, that that which we place before them is, whether they know it or not, calculated to be beneficial to them, and that, if they know it not now, they will know it when it is presented to them fairly. Shall we, then, purchase their applause at the expense of their substantial, nay, their spiritual interests?”

It was later on in this year (1844) that Sir R. Peel first gave notice of his intention to make some change in the academical education of Ireland, at the same time referring to the College of Maynooth, as follows :—

“The consideration of the Government will also be directed to the position of the College at Maynooth; for we feel that it is not now in a satisfactory state. The amount of the grant is of no consequence, so far as principle is concerned; for, if there be any violation of principle in making a grant for the support of Maynooth, that principle is violated by the sum at present granted. I know all the difficulties of the subject; but I will say no more than that her Majesty’s Government are impressed with the conviction that it is not in a satisfactory state at present, and that the position of that College will be one of the subjects to which the attention of the Government will be directed. When I say that, I think I may add that the attention of the Government will be directed to it in such a mode, as that the position of that College shall not be less satisfactory to those immediately connected with it than it is at present. I hope I shall not be called upon to say more.”

Important as was that announcement in itself, it led to results of, perhaps, equal moment. In consequence thereof, Mr. Gladstone, in the course of the autumn, resigned all his official appointments. At the time this was deemed, I believe, a master-stroke of policy; but I shall have something to say hereafter upon that point.

In 1845 his first speech was in self-vindication, and it was spoken on the meeting of Parliament, the line of defence being the following:—

“I have taken upon myself, some years ago, to state to the world, and that in a form the most detailed and deliberate, not under the influence of momentary consideration, nor impelled by the heat and pressure of debate, but in a published treatise, the views which I entertained on the subject of the relation of a Christian State to religion and to the Christian Church. Of all subjects, therefore, which could be raised for public con-

sideration, this, in its ultimate results the most important, I have treated in a manner the most detailed and deliberate. I have never, indeed, been guilty of the folly which has been charged upon me by some, of holding that there are any theories of political affairs, even in this their highest department, which are to be regarded alike under all circumstances as inflexible and immutable. *But, on the other hand, I have a strong conviction, speaking under ordinary circumstances, and as a general rule, that those who have thus borne the most solemn testimony to a particular view of a great constitutional question ought not to be parties responsible for proposals which involve a material departure from them.*

“Now, sir, it cannot fail to be in the recollection of the House that my right hon. friend at the head of the Government did, towards the close of the last session, allude to inquiries he was about to make into the possibility of extending academical education in Ireland, and he indicated the spirit in which that important matter might be examined. I am not even now in possession of the matured and particular intentions of the Government, and can only refer to them so far as they are known to me. I am, however, bound to say, in regard to what I believe the Government contemplate with respect to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth—a subject to which my right hon. friend made distinct allusion—that I know nothing beyond what might, allowably at least, though not necessarily, have been inferred from the intimations then made by my right hon. friend. But those intimations pointed to a measure at variance with the system which I had maintained and recommended as the best and most salutary scheme for the regulation of the relations between a Christian State and the Christian religion, and which I still believe to be the most salutary and the best *in every condition of the public sentiment that will bear its application.* I am very far from intending that no departure had already been made from that scheme. I do not stop at this time to inquire whether the occasion was sufficient to justify my act; whether in its immediate magnitude, and in the con-

sequences it might involve, it justly appeared to me to open up a new series of changes. Suffice it to say, I thought it a material alteration of that which, upon its own merits, I had presumed to recommend. I therefore held it, on the one hand, to be my duty, whenever such a measure should come before the House, to apply my mind to its consideration, *free from every slavish regard to a mere phantom of consistency*, and with the sole and single view of arriving at such a conclusion as, upon the whole, the interests of the country and the circumstances of the case might seem to demand. But, on the other hand, it is one thing to discharge that duty for myself, and from myself, in a position apart from office; it is quite another question whether, considering what I had declared, and the manner in which I had declared it, it would have been right, or would have served in any degree to accredit the proposal of my right hon. friend, if I, as a minister of the Crown, had been a party to his proposal.

"I can understand, and I have even ventured to vindicate as the most excellent and true, in a state of society able to appreciate its truth, the principle upon which a Christian state allies itself for religious purposes with the Christian Church, and with the Christian Church alone; but if *the time has come when, owing to the great advance of religious divisions, and likewise owing to a very great modification of political sentiments, what remains of that system must be further infringed*, then I cannot undertake to draw any line of distinction unfavourable to my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in Ireland in particular. And I fervently and earnestly trust that, if we are to change the policy of the State, and to substitute for the former practice of the Constitution one that gives a more indiscriminating support, then the Irish Roman Catholics will not be selected for proscription, but that they will be regarded as having a title to the favour of the Legislature upon a footing similar to that of other Christian professions differing from the Church."

The above quotations show, first, that Mr. Gladstone attempted to screen himself by an evasion.

“He had never been guilty of the folly of holding that there are any theories of political affairs which are to be regarded alike, under all circumstances, as inflexible and immutable.”

That may be ; but there can be no doubt what theory he held, up to 1842, touching the Maynooth Grant, as we shall see presently. In the second place, Mr. Gladstone laid down a general law of action in regard to certain persons who have borne the most solemn testimony to a particular view of a great constitutional question, which, had he carried it out, would have laid him under an obligation of keeping silence for ever upon constitutional questions, but which he has never ceased to disregard from that day to this. Thirdly, it will be seen upon what a fanciful crotchet Mr. Gladstone resigned his post, before even he was aware of what the Government actually intended. As to “slavish regard to a mere phantom of consistency,” Mr. Gladstone’s history of the last twenty years abundantly proves that that sentiment has not proved any serious obstacle to his movements.

The great feature, however, is the repeated attempt to represent his work, “The State in its Relations with the Church,” as a mere abstract theory, “most excellent and true in a state of society able to appreciate its truth.” No such reservation was ever suggested, I need hardly say, in the book itself. It was written, as has been already said, with a specific purpose, for the times, and with reference to practical legislation. This,

indeed, is evident from the extract presently to be quoted relative to the Maynooth Grant. But, to settle the point for ever as to what Mr. Gladstone did meditate up to 1842, in regard to the relations of the State with religious denominations, I shall again appeal to his own words:—

“ An intelligible basis is that upon which we stand, and upon which is joined, with the English Establishment, that northern one which, although it has lost the apostolical government and succession, nevertheless does embody a fixed and a definite form, if not a complete one, of religious truth. I do not say that such a position should have been taken, but that, having been taken, it may and should certainly be defended from further invasion.”

It is not very easy, perhaps, to convict Mr. Gladstone of positive definite statements; but I think the above quotation contains more than one. What, then, is to be thought of his subterfuges in 1845, by which he intimated that the principle of State connexion, vindicated in his published work and speeches up to 1842, was merely hypothetical, and not designed to regulate those relations in this country and this age?

But I must also remark that, with the exception of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, no legislative changes whatever had taken place between 1841 and 1845, to alter the relative positions of the Church and other religious denominations. Besides, what were the great advances of religious divisions and the great modifications of political sentiments, in that interval of three

years? Were these divisions advanced by Tractarianism, or by the Conservative Government? Lastly, I think we have yet to learn that religious divisions can greatly advance, and yet political sentiments become very greatly modified, at one and the same time.

However, up to 1842, at least—and we may possibly allow a year longer—Mr. Gladstone's view of the Maynooth Grant was the following:—

“The support of the College of Maynooth was originally undertaken by the Protestant Parliament of Ireland, in the anticipation, which has since proved miserably fallacious, that a more loyal class of priests would be produced by a home education than by a foreign one. Instead of which, it has been found that the facility of education at home has opened the priesthood to a lower and less cultivated class. It can hardly be denied that this is a well-merited disappointment. If the State gives anything of pecuniary support, it should, in consistency, give everything. *Unless it is bound in conscience to maintain the national Church as God's appointed vehicle of religious truth, it should adopt as its rule the numbers and the needs of the several classes of religionists*; and in either aspect the claim of the Roman Catholics is infinitely the strongest. In amount this grant is niggardly and unworthy. *In principle it is wholly vicious, and it will be a thorn in the side of the State of these countries, so long as it is continued.* When foreigners express their astonishment at finding that we support, in Ireland, the Church of a small minority, we may tell them that we support it on the high ground of conscientious necessity, for its truth; but how should we blush at the same time to support an institution whose avowed and legitimate purpose it is constantly to denounce that truth as falsehood! If, indeed, our faith be pledged to the College, by all means let us acquit ourselves of the obligation; but it is monstrous that we should be the

voluntary feeders of an establishment which exhibits at once our jealous parsimony, our lax principles, and our erroneous calculations."

Subsequently, on the second reading of the Maynooth College Bill, by which the original grant was trebled, Mr. Gladstone spoke as follows :—

"I must hold that it is the duty of Government, according to its just prerogatives and its opportunities, to form a judgment upon religion, and to act in support of it. In political society the will and conscience of each individual cannot be supreme; and if, placed as we all are, by Divine ordinance, in political society, we are to insist, every man for himself, that his own will and opinion, without bating one jot or tittle of it, shall take effect, and that all others shall conform themselves to it, and that it shall be the model of the land; I say he that holds this doctrine proclaims a principle which, if it be universally adopted, is fatal to political society, and must issue in its utter disorganization. *I must inquire, then, sir, into the ability of the State to promote religious truth, as being, under any given circumstances, the measure of its duty.*

"And here I must fervently say, Happy is that land in which religious unity prevails among the people, and in which, because it prevails among the people, it can also be maintained as the characteristic of the acts and legislation of the Government. I cannot scruple, sir, to place that religious unity at the very head of the list of all social and civil blessings. My hon. friend who sits by me, the Member for the University of Oxford (Sir H. Inglis), is at the head of this opposition. He holds firmly by a rule which is perfectly intelligible, and by which I too would closely hold, if I could persuade myself that the state of the general convictions of the country, and its divisions, would warrant it; *namely, that of the exclusive support of the national religion.*

"It is well known that the connexion of the Church with the State continues to exist among us, as a general rule, and that, both in England and in Ireland, the Church has a great prominence among the established institutions of the country; and long may it so remain: but yet the rigid theory of exclusive support to the Church has for so many years, and in so many ways, been progressively impaired, that I no longer can think it equitable to urge it as forming of itself a conclusive reason for the rejection of a measure that applies public money to the purposes of some other communion.

"What then, sir, will the Irish Roman Catholic perceive when he comes to examine our conduct, after we have rejected this Bill upon the allegation of a religious objection? We make votes of money from year to year, without resistance, for persons not agreeing with the national religion; and let it not be said these votes are for persons who, if they differ from the national Church, differ upon matters secondary and unimportant. Is there any likelihood that these votes will be altered or discontinued? On any of the numerous opportunities that they present to us, does any member propose it? In point of fact, they are voted year after year as a mere matter of course, or little more. I must then recognise this as being so far an established fact. I may and I do lament it; but, if I cannot alter it, it would be dishonest to refuse to recognise both it and what it entails and involves. I cannot find in our existing system—I cannot find in those convictions of the people, with regard to it, which form the actual material for governing the country—*any principle of a substantive and consistent character, founded upon equality of dealing towards the several sections of the people*, which will sustain me in the rejection of the Bill.

"I am bound, sir, to add, that, whatever I may think of votes of money for Arian and Socinian purposes, I am not able to conceive in what manner we can withdraw them, because I do not know by what rule this House, *having once departed from the rule of exclusive support to the established religion* of the country, could distinguish, with any certainty and permanence,

between Dissenters who are Arian and those who are not, or could draw the line within which, on account of their supposed proximity to religious truth, particular forms of belief should be qualified for the favour of the State, and beyond which they should be excluded from it.

"I think this Bill important, most of all important with regard to the principles which it involves. I am very far indeed from saying that it virtually decides upon the payment of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland by the State; but I do not deny that it disposes of the religious objections to that measure. I mean that we who assent to this Bill shall, in my judgment, no longer be in a condition to plead religious objections to such a project. There are many political and social questions which may arise in connexion with it. These may indefinitely retard its approach; they may raise insuperable objections to its being carried into execution, or they may not; but I think we must not conceal from ourselves that the acceptance of this measure, introduced in the year 1845, and under auspices of such authority, will preclude the rejection, on any grounds purely religious, of the other.

"In my opinion we have but two alternatives: either to announce some constitutional principle capable of being defined and understood, to which the law of the land and the practice of the Government may be made to conform, and which will, as a principle, exclude this measure; or if Parliament will not adopt such a principle and give it effect, then I think that common honesty binds us to admit the Roman Catholics of Ireland to be free to urge their claims against the State, upon a footing of equality with other religious bodies in circumstances like their own, as policy and justice may require."

Contrast now, with those sentiments, first, the speech of 1838, on the Maynooth Grant, and secondly, the extracts before given from his work, of which the fourth edition, "revised and enlarged," appeared in 1841. Up

to 1842, at least, Mr. Gladstone agreed, not only in theory, but in his practical policy, with Sir H. Inglis, in upholding the exclusive system of Church and State connexion. No compromise could be allowed. The State had a conscience; that conscience required the sanctions of religion to keep it in the right path. But it could only recognise one form of religion, for no two different religions could be true, and that religion would be the only pure form of the Catholic Church—the Anglican branch. Moreover, whether that Church were liked or no; whether, as in Ireland, it were even the Church of a minority, it was, nevertheless, the duty of the State to establish it and to maintain it. In short, it was the duty of the State, everywhere and under all circumstances, to support and to propagate the Anglican Church and no other, except under special contract.

Expediency, as Macaulay writes, was held in abhorrence by the whole party with which Mr. Gladstone acted up to 1842. But in 1845 how vast the change! Expediency is the one only principle left. Besides, as, up to 1842, Mr. Gladstone excelled all his party in building up abstractions and insisting upon the exclusive system; so, in 1845, he laid down the principle of expediency on a wider basis even than its ancient votaries. In his prospective gaze was included not only the endowment of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, but the principle of universal religious equality.

How was this portentous revolution of opinion justi-

fied? Simply upon the ground of the various annual votes in Parliament to different denominations. But what new votes had been added since 1841—that is, since Mr. Gladstone upheld the opposite and exclusive system? These votes, indeed, were all reviewed and enumerated in his own book. But what was the inference then deduced? That they were not only obnoxious and vicious in principle, but only tolerable because the State was pledged to their maintenance. In short, they were pointed out as warnings. But in 1845 they were appealed to as examples, as something partaking of principles, or, at all events, as proofs of a principle—the principle of religious equality. But the change that had occurred from 1842 to 1845 was not in these votes themselves. So far as I know, they had suffered neither diminution nor increase. It was Mr. Gladstone who had changed.

However, the second reading of the Maynooth Bill was carried by 323 to 176, notwithstanding the vigorous opposition of Sir H. Inglis, Colonels Sibthorp and Verner, Mr. Spooner and Mr. Newdegate, aided by their tellers, Lord Ashley and Mr. J. C. Colquhoun. The third reading was also carried by 317 to 184, on which occasion Sir H. Inglis and Mr. Bankes were the tellers, whilst in the minority were Colonels Verner and Sibthorp, Lord Ashley, Mr. Spooner, and Mr. Newdegate. As to Sir S. Glynne, absent on the second reading, he voted on the third, in the majority, as did Mr. Gladstone on both occasions.

I may add, that Mr. Gladstone's appearance in his new character did not escape the observation of one who, since 1845, has won his spurs. This is the commencement of the right hon. the present leader of the Conservative party in the Commons :—

“ What is the result of the adroit argumentation of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) ? It is this : that the principle upon which the State has hitherto been connected with the ecclesiastical affairs of this country is worn out. We must seek a new principle. But where is the new principle ? The right hon. gentleman, in his argument to-night, has made one great assumption : ‘ You have endowed the Anglican Church. Can you, in fact, refuse to endow the Roman Church ? ’ But have we, in fact, endowed the Anglican Church ? That is a question. I will go to the argument, founded on circumstances, of the right hon. gentleman. *I am somewhat astonished that he should so completely have given up principles. I looked upon the right hon. gentleman as the last Paladin of principle, the very chivalry of abstraction ; and, when a question was raised which touched the elementary principle of ecclesiastical institutions, I never supposed that it would be the right hon. gentleman who would come and give the House the small change of circumstances to settle this great account.* ”

There is yet another question of 1845 indicative of Mr. Gladstone's metamorphosis. Besides increasing the Maynooth Grant, it is well known that Sir R. Peel's scheme of academical education for Ireland, in 1845, included the establishment of what are termed the Queen's Colleges. Now, these colleges were based upon these three principles, among others : 1. That there should be no religious test required. 2. That no

theological examination should be deemed necessary as a part of the college discipline. 3. That there should be no attempt whatever to interfere, by the college authorities, with the religious opinions of the students.

On the introduction of this measure, it was designated by Sir H. Inglis "a gigantic scheme of godless education," and was resisted both on the second and third reading by the Tory section, including Sir H. Inglis, Mr. Estcourt, Colonel Sibthorp, Sir S. Glynne, Mr. Spooner, and Mr. Newdegate. Of course Mr. Gladstone again voted in the majority; but, on going into Committee, Lord Mahon moved the following resolution :—

"That it is the opinion of this House, that, in the establishment of colleges in Ireland, provision should be made for the religious instruction of the pupils by means of lecture-fees, till such time as private benefactions for that object may have taken effect."

This resolution, however, was lost by 189 votes to 49; Mr. Gladstone voting in the majority, as before, though Sir S. Glynne and Mr. Estcourt were in the minority. Thus, from insisting, up to 1842, that the State should not only support and propagate one religion, but only one, and that the Anglican Church; Mr. Gladstone, in 1845, voted, first, for supporting and propagating Roman Catholicism, which in his work he had denounced as heresy and schism, and then for extending education without, or independent altogether of, any religion ;

very ground that it entailed the admission of Jews to Parliament—though an independent member, Mr. Gladstone never contested it, either by speech or vote, on any single occasion. Nay, more, as we shall presently find, within little more than two years from the passing of this measure of 1845, and on the very first opportunity possible, Mr. Gladstone himself based upon it an elaborate argument for the admission of Jews to Parliament.

Upon this subject I may add another remark. Had the Jew Bill of 1845 preceded the Maynooth Grant Bill, Mr. Gladstone's recreancy might have sheltered itself under this plea, that by the Jew Bill all was lost which remained of the principle of Church and State connexion worth fighting for. That might not have been a very satisfactory plea; but, at least, it would have afforded a colourable pretext for abandoning his former position. For it is plain that Mr. Gladstone, up to 1842, made a species of reservation in favour of the exclusion of the Jews from Parliament. However, even this ground of justification is cut away from Mr. Gladstone, by the fact that the Jew Bill was not passed till July; whereas the Maynooth Grant Bill was read a second time at the beginning of April. It follows, therefore, that the revolution in Mr. Gladstone's views, openly professed at the meeting of Parliament in 1845, originated in and with himself, not in any innovations upon the basis of Church and State connexion between 1841 and 1845; and it was that marvellous change which dictated his

policy of silent acquiescence in the Jew Bill of 1845, as it also prompted his active support of the claims of the Jews to sit in Parliament in 1847. His conduct, however, on both occasions, is a testimony to the depth and force of that moral furnace through which his views had passed. It serves, indeed, to prove that, whether from despairing of his original theory of Church and State relations, or from being desirous to cancel it, he was ready himself to assist towards what, up to 1842, he deemed "a fatal decision" for the union of Church and State; that is, the admission of Jews to Parliament.

At the close of 1845, Lord Stanley having resigned the post, Mr. Gladstone at once accepted the Secretaryship of the Colonies. On presenting himself, however, for re-election to the borough of Newark, he was rejected, Mr. J. Stuart being returned in his stead. During the stirring events of 1846, therefore, Sir R. Peel, when his need was sorest, lacked the aid of Mr. Gladstone. In fact, Mr. Gladstone was out of Parliament for nearly two years, having lost his seat at the beginning of 1846, and not being returned for any constituency till the General Election of 1847.

It was in this year, 1845, I may add, that the *Guardian* newspaper was founded. How faithfully that journal has stood by one of its chief founders; how truly it has represented Gladstonism, whatever that creed might be,—is written in its weekly records from that year downwards.

Here, then, having reached another stage in our course, let us pause to recapitulate what has transpired from the year 1842. That some change had come over Mr. Gladstone between 1841 and 1846 is partly shown by his rejection in the latter year for Newark, and in his being superseded by Mr. J. Stuart. That a mighty convulsion, indeed, had swept over his opinions I take to be evident from his own admissions in 1844 and 1845. Up to 1842 he had upheld, both within and without the walls of Parliament, the paternal theory of Government. As a corollary to that principle, he also insisted upon what he has termed the rigid theory of exclusive support to the Church, that—

“The State was bound in conscience to maintain the national Church as God’s appointed vehicle of religious truth.”

Or, in other words, that—

“The Government, as a Government, was bound to maintain that form of belief which it conceived to maintain the largest portion of truth with the smallest admixture of error.”

In 1845 both the paternal theory of government and the exclusive system of State-connexion had disappeared for ever. In its place, moreover, Mr. Gladstone had substituted the very opposite theory—*“the numbers and the needs of the several classes of religionists”*—the results of which he had formerly, in 1835, prefigured as follows :—

“If those individuals who were called upon to fill the high functions of administering public affairs should be compelled to exclude from their consideration the element of true religion, and

to view various strange and conflicting doctrines in the same light, instead of administering those noble functions, they would become helots and slaves."

In short, in 1845 Mr. Gladstone himself not only lent a hand to destroy what, up to 1842 at the least, he proclaimed to be the true theory of government, that is, the paternal theory, and to eradicate the principle of conscience altogether from government, but to raise up in its stead a theory of government which he had represented to be—

"Purely a mechanical contrivance for representing, in the same proportions in which they are entertained, the wishes of the people ; in which view it might be desirable that all sects should have religious aid, and the government would incur no guilt. But why? Because it is by the very supposition purely servile, and has no free agency of its own ; no right to do otherwise than as the numerical majority of the people command. If it has a free agency, or a competency to act upon its own conviction and conscience in matters of religion, how can we wish that, by supporting all creeds, no matter what their amount of difference, it should confound together truth and falsehood, and feed heresy out of what ought to be the patrimony of the faith ?"

In other words, he who up to 1842 had held closely and solely by what he subsequently termed "*the rigid theory of exclusive support to the Church,*" had in 1845 given in his full and final adhesion to the principle of "*equality of dealing towards the several sections of the people ;*" that is, to religious equality as opposed to the exclusive system.

But another consideration starts up before us as we contemplate the Mr. Gladstone of 1845. If his first theory of religious equality was that of *establishing* or *endowing* all sects, how far did that theory commit him to the other system of religious equality, which consists in *disendowing* and *disestablishing* all denominations alike, and therefore in separating the Church and State? This question is thus disposed of in "The State in its Relations with the Church :"—

"When the *State* is indifferently composed of all creeds, it can have no conscientious obligation to one; and it will probably obtain some momentary and most delusive calm when it has placed all on the same footing of pecuniary countenance and support. But will this last? It might be difficult to determine whether it be or be not desirable that it should. The fact, at least, is unquestionable, that the system termed American has utterly vanished from the face of the land which gave it birth."

Again :—

"We may see abundant reasons to believe that, when the *State* shall have finally cast off its allegiance to and preference for the Church, and shall have substituted in its stead the practice of undistinguishing support to whatever terms itself religion, or even to professing Christianity in all its forms, it will soon be found the more convenient and natural course to withhold all interference with the pecuniary affairs of religious societies. When nothing is given to any form of religion whatever by the Government, then no ground of complaint will be left, and not till then."

Do not these quotations prove that, in Mr. Gladstone's own opinion, the principle of religious equality, enun-

ciated by him in 1845, tends directly and naturally to the disestablishment of every religion, and therefore to the separation of Church and State primarily?

Another question here forces itself upon our attention. Have we any reason for suspecting Mr. Gladstone of any intention or idea of separating Church and State in 1845? Was there no connexion between the collapse of Tractarianism and the collapse of Mr. Gladstone's Toryism? Certain it is that both systems came down about the same time, or within the same interval. Tract 90 appeared in 1841. The outcry it caused was followed by a lamentable defection from the Church of England. Dr. Newman himself was figuratively on his death-bed, as he says, from that time. From 1843 to 1845 he was drifting rapidly to Rome. Now, with the Tractarian party the contest lay between Anglicanism and Liberalism; and, on Dr. Newman's perversion, many of his friends actually lapsed into Liberalism, as he foresaw they would do. Had Mr. Gladstone been an ecclesiastic, I deem it more than probable that he would have accompanied Dr. Newman. Being a civilian and a politician, his perversion more naturally took a political turn. It was the discarding of Toryism and the adoption of Liberalism.

And for that perversion he could allege several, to him, satisfactory reasons. In the first place, Mr. Gladstone must have become aware, before 1845, that Toryism was not only impracticable, but powerless to uphold his original theory of exclusive State-connexion.

Secondly, he would have seen that it was the Tory party which declaimed most loudly and vigorously against Tractarianism. In the third place, by the development of Liberalism he might have discerned another and a more effectual plan for upholding his favourite ecclesiastical dogmas. For I maintain that all his political theories have been, and still are, moulded and fashioned to fit in with certain theological tenets.

What, then, was the Liberal method for upholding those religious dogmas upon which Tractarianism was founded? It was and is the disruption of the union of Church and State. To save the dogmas, the Liberal will sacrifice the temporalities. Between 1841 and 1845 there had also occurred much to tempt Mr. Gladstone to turn round and advocate that principle of divorce. It was the union of Church and State which, though indirectly, had proved fatal to Tractarianism. State prohibitions were demanded on that ground; State-appointed bishops contributed to swell the popular clamour on that ground; and, finally, it was State-interference, however indirect the application, which ultimately suppressed the insidious tracts.

Besides, the union of Church and State was viewed from the first with sinister eye by many leading Tractarians, as is the case even now. Dr. Newman witnesses thus:—

“ With Froude, Erastianism, that is, the union (so he viewed it) of Church and State, was the parent, or, if not the parent, the

serviceable and sufficient tool, of Liberalism (religious). Till that union was snapped, Christian doctrine never could be safe."

This I believe to have been Mr. Gladstone's conclusion as well, in the year 1845. In his speech, indeed, in favour of the Maynooth Grant being trebled, he had taken occasion to utter the following remarks:—

"If the State grants to the Church the privilege of endowment (*sic*), and some other privileges, chiefly of an honorary kind, on the other hand, it imposes upon the Church severe restrictions. It is a scheme of giving and taking, both upon the part of the State and upon the part of the Church. The State restrains her right of synodical assembly; it fetters in many ways her original and organic power; it imposes limits upon her discipline and laws; and even the expression of any of her doctrines cannot be varied without its knowledge and assent."

Such considerations as I have adduced seem to favour the idea that the separation of Church and State might have occurred to Mr. Gladstone, even in 1845, as not altogether disadvantageous to Anglicanism, and therefore as, at least, a last refuge for dogma.

In considering this question of Mr. Gladstone's ulterior views in 1845, some account must also be taken of his temperament and habits. By nature, then, and by habit, he is prone, beyond all Englishmen, to broad generalizations, to abstract theories, to comprehensive propositions. Hence a perpetual tendency to extremes. Having, then, once let go his hold on Toryism, it was not in Mr. Gladstone to become and remain a Conserva-

tive. The epithet would sound to him, as we are told it did to Froude, one of reproach. He could not go so far, and short of the actual end, like Sir R. Peel. The first bend of the twig snapped it asunder in Mr. Gladstone's case. With the first shake, then, of his Tory system, the whole edifice tottered to its fall. Besides, as Toryism had helped to stifle Tractarianism, Mr. Gladstone would be nothing loath to lend a hand to pull down Toryism.

At all events, a mighty hurricane had swept over Mr. Gladstone's political views between 1841 and 1845. During that interval his Toryism had been supplanted by Liberalism. He had surrendered the paternal theory of government, and, as part of that theory, he had also abandoned the exclusive system of State-connexion. In their stead he had patched up a theory of religious equality, which went to establish or endow all sects indifferently. But the admissions of his published works, the tone of his mind and disposition, the circumstances of the times, and subsequent events, all conduce to the conviction that, so early as 1845 even, Mr. Gladstone had contemplated, and not with dismay, that ulterior form of religious equality which consists in the disestablishing of all religions alike, and therefore implies necessarily the separation of Church and State.

In what way this opinion is confirmed by Mr. Gladstone's passive approval of the Jew Bill of 1845 has been pointed out before.

I may add that Mr. Gladstone's hasty resumption of

office at the close of 1845 called forth in many quarters severe strictures. This is known, that every other member of the Government, at that time, was either thinking of resigning, or had already resigned office. Having done penance by a year's sacrifice of place, it would seem that Mr. Gladstone's conscience permitted him not only to forget all his antecedents, but complacently to resume office, with the express purpose of sweeping away whatever remained of former pledges. So much easier is each successive plunge into the gulf of tergiversation.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

 FROM 1847 TO 1859.

RELIGIOUS EQUALITY—ENDOWMENT OF ALL RELIGIONS.

As stated before, Mr. Gladstone lost his seat for Newark in 1846, and was out of Parliament during that year and the first session of 1847. At the General Election, however, in 1847, he was returned, along with his *quondam* Tory friend Sir H. Inglis, for the University of Oxford; but, though returned, Mr. Gladstone had to contest the seat against Mr. Round. That opposition may be justly ascribed to Mr. Gladstone's history subsequent to 1841, for, up to that year inclusive, he and Sir H. Inglis were, politically at least, *par nobile fratrum*.

University elections, unfortunately, dispense with certain salutary safeguards against fraud and imposition.

There are no public addresses and no speeches by the candidates, and therefore no interpellations and no cross-examination. It requires, then, no stretch of imagination to conceive that Mr. Gladstone was returned, in 1847, for Oxford University, under what, in another case, would be called false pretences. It might reasonably be supposed that, though he had changed his votes and speeches between 1841 and 1846, he had simply changed Toryism for Conservatism. It could not be known, even approximately, how far he had gone beyond Conservatism, between 1845 and the General Election in 1847. And, no formal declaration of sentiments being required at a University election, how were the electors to ascertain Mr. Gladstone's views, except by reference to his former votes and speeches or published works? How would such materials enable them to divine his future designs, or even his opinions at the time? So far from guiding to a right direction, would they not rather tend to create erroneous impressions and to delude the electors in 1847?

This, indeed, I believe to have been the literal truth. I believe that Mr. Gladstone was returned for Oxford University, in 1847, on the strength of his previous votes, speeches, and published works prior to 1846. And although some palpable change had come over him during the last four years of his parliamentary career, I maintain that the University electors did not and could not be aware of the exact measure of that change, much less could they calculate the additional momentum

it had acquired between 1845 and the General Election of 1847, and least of all could they foresee that accumulated force it was destined to gain in the immediate or remote future. Judging, then, by the law of probabilities, I say it is only a fair and reasonable hypothesis to suppose that, in 1847, Mr. Gladstone was elected for Oxford University on the strength of what he had been, and on the trust that he was and would still be the same, or similar; and not on condition that he should be what he turned out to be, and what, as it proved, he really was at the time; for, that his first votes and speeches in Parliament, in the autumn of 1847, startled many of his own friends and supporters at Oxford is not less sure than that they were truly startling in themselves.

The question upon which Mr. Gladstone first rose was the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, "for the further repeal of Acts of Parliament imposing pains and penalties upon her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects on account of their religious opinions." One object, indeed, of that measure was to legalize the establishment of religious orders. On the second reading, which was passed by 168 to 135, the Opposition was led by Sir H. Inglis; Sir R. Peel was absent, but Mr. Gladstone, among other things, said:—

"In some respects, sir, it is my misfortune that I am unable to give the same vote on this measure as my hon. colleague (Sir H. Inglis); and I should not think it respectful to him, nor to the distinguished constituency which I have the honour to represent, if I gave my first vote upon a subject necessarily interesting to them—although I have no means of knowing their

feelings upon it—without stating the grounds upon which I give that vote.

“We may be fairly called upon, after the lapse of 18 years, and after the great change that has taken place in the constitution of Parliament, and the many alterations which that Parliament has brought about—we may, I say, be fairly called upon to show cause for continuing those exclusions (of 1829) on the Statute Book.”

The full significance of these two paragraphs was brought out soon after by Mr. Gladstone's speech on the resolution, moved by Lord J. Russell, then Premier, for the removal of Jewish disabilities, with the special object of admitting Jews to Parliament. This speech deserves particular notice, not only as confirmatory of all I have before advanced relative to Mr. Gladstone's change of views, but as presaging all that has happened, or shall happen in the future, of an innovating character. I hold, indeed, that no more thoroughly revolutionary doctrines were ever broached in Parliament than are contained in Mr. Gladstone's speech of December 16th, 1847. I shall therefore lay before the reader an unusually copious supply of extracts from that speech.

“I am quite sure that I shall not appeal in vain to the indulgence of the House, when I refer to the fact that my hon. friend and colleague (Sir H. Inglis) has to-night presented the petition of that learned body against the projected measure of the noble lord, and when I state with deep regret, so far as regards my relation to that learned body, that, not without pain, indeed; but after full consideration, and with firm conviction, it is my intention, because I feel it to be my duty, to support the measure which we are now assembled to discuss.

"I must confess that, when I consider my own position, as having the honour of representing the University of Oxford, with respect to this question as a question of giving or withholding certain civil privileges, I feel not a greater reluctance to give, because I have that honour, but a greater reluctance to withhold. I feel a very great reluctance to be the instrument, even in my own small measure, of placing the University in conflict with the civil privileges and civil rights, if such they be, of any portion of my fellow-subjects. I do not scruple to confess a feeling which I deeply entertain: I think that we have too indiscriminately and too long pursued that policy; and further, when I review the position in which we stand at the present moment, I, for one, am not satisfied with the practical results which it has produced.

"It appears, then, that you first contended for a Church Parliament; you then contended for a Protestant Parliament: in both cases you were defeated. You were not defeated un-awares: you were not defeated owing to accident. You were defeated owing to profound and powerful and uniform tendencies, associated with the movement of the human mind, with the general course of events; perhaps I ought to say with the providential government of the world. *'And, when we plead and argue upon the British laws and the British Constitution, I really must ask, with the hon. member for Oldham (Mr. W. J. Fox), what right have we to fix upon some one particular period, be it 50, or 100, or 200 years ago, and say 'I will take the basis of that particular period, and I will say there begins and there ends the British Constitution?' On the contrary, I say that the very same principle which makes me regard Magna Charta as a part of the British Constitution, the same principle which makes me regard the Bill of Rights as a part of the British Constitution, and the Act of Uniformity, and other Acts—I do not mean to say as all equally important in all their provisions, but all forming parts of our constitutional system—by the same principle, I think, in general justice, whether I like them or not, independently, in a degree of personal opinion, we who meet here in 1847 are bound to*

recognise to a great extent, as facts, those laws which have fully and deeply entered into the political system of the country, which hardly any one desires to change, which no one attempts to supersede, which we all, on coming here, profess to accept, and which I think we are bound to assume as data, as fixed points, in our discussions, and therefore to apply and develop in the spirit of fairness and justice.

“It appears, then, we have now arrived at a stage in which, after two or three generations had contended for a Church Parliament, and two or three more contended for a Protestant Parliament, each being in succession beaten, we are called upon to decide the question, whether we shall contend for a Christian Parliament.

“The discussion in which we are engaged does not turn upon the question whether the Christian religion is needless for the work of government and legislation. It must first of all be shown that the admission of an extremely small fraction of Jews into Parliament would paralyze and nullify the Christianity of all those who sit there. We may consistently affirm that Christianity is in the highest degree needful for our legislation, and yet decline to follow out that proposition to a conclusion so rigid as this, that every individual who is not a Christian should be excluded from the possibility of becoming a legislator. *If we are now a Christian nation, we shall, even after removing the disabilities of the Jews, be a Christian Parliament; if it be true that we must then cease to be a Christian Parliament, it is also true that we are not now a Christian nation.*

“In the year 1841, opposing the Bill then introduced for the admission of Jews to municipal offices, I argued, and I founded my opposition upon the principle, that no broad or clear line could be drawn between their eligibility for what was then in question, and their eligibility for Parliament. Although in this place we may commonly look upon the name of municipal office without any very lively sentiment of veneration, yet what does it involve? It involves the magistracy; it involves the performance of judicial duties; it involves the administration

of laws which are Christian laws, founded upon and made conformable to the principles of Christianity; and I cannot find a breadth of standing-ground for my foot, which will enable me, on the one hand, to say that the Jew is fit for the solemn administration of those laws, and for the administration of Christian oaths to Christian men, and yet, upon religious grounds, is absolutely unfitted to enter this assembly.

“I should betray my most especial and solemn duty were I to give my assent to this measure without having endeavoured to consider very maturely its whole bearings upon the interests of the Church;—I will add, without having satisfied my mind that its adoption ought not to work them injury. I cannot hesitate to say that, from the general course of events, and in particular from the changes which have been introduced, and which are now proposed in the constitution of the Legislature, a very great degree, an increased degree of delicacy and caution has become necessary in the management of its relations with the Church; and that the want of that delicacy and caution, of kindly and considerate feeling, would in all probability lead to very serious ulterior consequences. I mean that it would have the effect of producing throughout the country, among the clergy, and among all the more seriously attached members of the Church, a desire for what is termed organic change in the connexion between the Church and the State. I use the phrase organic change to distinguish what I now have in view, from changes not cutting so deep, from practical and administrative improvements. Now, I do not know whether there are any persons in this House—if so, they must be few, and probably of extreme opinions—who contemplate and desire such organic change in the connexion between Church and State. If there be such, I am not one of them; I am deeply anxious to obviate any demand for changes of that nature. This, then, is what I desire, in the interests of my constituents and in the interest of the Church, that, as you continue from time to time to admit among you those who cannot justly be expected to have sympathy with the laws and the spiritual purposes of the Church,

you should likewise recognise and act upon the principle that a consideration for the clergy and the other members of the Church, as such, a disposition to attach weight to their feelings and views, a regard to them as a body having, like the members of other religious bodies, conscientious convictions, and entitled to have those convictions respected, should influence Parliament in the exercise of its legislative powers as they bear upon the affairs of the Church, and should also influence the ministers of the Crown in the exercise of those very important executive powers of patronage or otherwise, which fall to them in that capacity. I think myself entitled to believe that Parliament is disinclined to extreme views, of whatever kind, in regard to the affairs of the Church. A time might possibly arrive when it might be otherwise. If there should be any rapid or violent movement of the popular mind, or in some season of temporary excitement—however improbable such contingencies may justly be considered—a majority of this House might possibly be disposed to pursue a severe and hostile policy towards the Church, and might also incline the Minister of the Crown to act in a similar spirit, I cannot but express it as my most solemn conviction, that the adoption of any jealous, aggressive, or coercive policy of that kind towards the Church would be attended with the most deplorable results. Especially, in regard to the Church, you must infuse a genial and a kindly spirit into all your proceedings, unless you are prepared to take upon yourselves the responsibility of one or the other of two tremendous evils: either the evil of paralyzing all spiritual energies in an age of indifference; or in an age of religious warmth and excitement, and of rising faith with the Church, such as this, the evil of exasperating those energies, and of causing convulsions which might ultimately prove almost as detrimental to the civil as to the ecclesiastical institutions of the country. If, therefore, we desire to see what is called a working or an efficient church—a clergy that will toil without remission until it has covered the whole space, now unhappily void, amongst the people, with the *life-giving ordinances of religion*—acting with zeal and love, as well as with a true moderation, in the spirit of that

system of faith and discipline under which they are appointed to work, we cannot contribute to this purpose, though we may defeat it by a policy of jealousy and repression; we may contribute towards it, if the duties of the State in Church affairs be discharged in a wise, considerate, I will say also, in a genial, and friendly, and something of a confiding temper. Such, then, is the mode in which, as it appears to me, it would not be difficult to provide sufficiently against the embarrassments which might otherwise arise out of the successive infusion of many new and alien ingredients into the composition of the Legislature."

These extracts will suffice to show that the speech of 1847 comprehended not only the removal of Jewish disabilities, but a general law which, in its direct, logical, and natural application, leads not only to the separation of Church and State, but to endless innovations in all time, as well in our civil as our ecclesiastical polity. If all members of Parliament are bound, as Mr. Gladstone affirmed, to assume as *data*, as fixed points in their discussions, and therefore to apply and develope whatever laws have been passed on constitutional questions, when and where are we to stop?

Let us take an illustration of Mr. Gladstone's theory in practical legislation. Up to 1842 he maintained that the admission of Jews to Parliament would powerfully assist towards a fatal decision for the union of Church and State. Since then Jews have been admitted. According to Mr. Gladstone's theory we are bound to take that fact as a *datum* or fixed point in our discussions, and apply and develope it, just as Magna Charta, or the Bill of Rights, or the Act of Uniformity were fixed

points or *data*. Does it not follow, then, that, year by year, we ought to apply and develop a system of separating Church and State? To be sure, Mr. Gladstone's instances of *data* were somewhat perplexing. Suppose, at his instigation, the nation had taken the Act of Uniformity as a *datum* or fixed point, and devoted itself to applying and developing that principle, where should we have been now? However, it is only fair to suppose that Mr. Gladstone's *data* were precisely of the opposite character, and that he only intended us to apply and develop the enactments of the previous 20 years, and all such as should be passed subsequent to 1847. In that case, then, he committed himself, and he wished to commit Parliament, to a precedent which will certainly allow neither ourselves nor posterity, "to the last syllable of recorded time," either to rest or be thankful. It must, however, in justice to all parties, be remembered that Mr. Gladstone borrowed that theory from the late Mr. W. J. Fox, M.P. for Oldham, and one of the rankest, though, I believe, honestest Democrats and Anti-State Church champions of the age.

As to Mr. Gladstone's arguments in favour of Jews being admitted to Parliament, because they had been admitted to municipal privileges, and that such admission would not un-Christianize Parliament, it may be worth while to contrast with the statements of 1847, those advanced in 1841, as well as some extracts quoted at the close of 1845, upon the same subjects. When, however, Mr. Gladstone stated "that *you* first contended

for a Church Parliament," &c., he might, I think, without any imputation of egotism, have put *we* instead of *you*.

With respect, again, to his new specific of 1847, for preserving the union of Church and State, or, at all events, for

"Providing sufficiently against the embarrassments which might otherwise arise out of the successive infusion of many new and alien ingredients into the composition of the Legislature,"

if the duties of the State in Church affairs should be discharged in a wise and considerate, and, moreover, in a genial, friendly, and something of a confiding temper, I should like to know whether Mr. Gladstone's conduct since 1847 is to be taken as an exemplification of that temper? If so, then in 1847 he adopted not only a new code of principles but a new code of tempers in his dealings with the Church, from Finsbury Chapel.

Nevertheless, Mr. Gladstone contrived to mix up a protest in favour of his own cherished Anglican dogmas, with the creed of Mr. W. J. Fox.

"I am by no means of opinion," he said, "that differences of religion have no bearing upon the discharge of political duties of whatever class; I do not hold that all men, whatever their religious creeds, are equally qualified for those duties; I look upon a right religious belief as among the elements of competency for them."

I need hardly add that Mr. Gladstone's speech

created a sensation, and Mr. Newdegate was giving expression to a general conviction when he stated, that,

“Had it been known that the right hon. gentleman entertained such sentiments as he had expressed on the subject of the Jews, when he offered himself as a candidate for the representation of Oxford University, he (Mr. Newdegate) was certain that he never could have been returned for that eminent seat of learning.”

With that delicate and sensitive conscience of his, Mr. Gladstone was, of course, the best judge of what became him. Otherwise there might appear something at least equivocal in appealing, as he did, to his position as representative for Oxford University, to strengthen his advocacy in 1847 in behalf of the Jews, especially when we consider that he had only just been returned, and upon very doubtful security; that the University had petitioned against the proposal; that its other and senior representative headed the Opposition; and moreover, that Mr. Gladstone had himself, but a few years before, described the admission of persons who denied Christianity, into the national Legislature, as not merely the crucial test of the union of Church and State, but as assisting powerfully towards a fatal decision. It will be seen hereafter, however, that Mr. Gladstone never forgets to renew the same appeal, whenever he advocates anything peculiarly offensive either to the Church or the University.

In 1848, on the second reading of the Diplomatic Relations with Rome Bill, Mr. Gladstone—

“Would not, from any fear of being misapprehended, and of being thought to entertain views regarding future schemes, which he would leave to be dealt with when their time of ripeness came—he would not, from any such considerations, withhold his support from this measure. If it was true that, on certain occasions, when a spirit of disaffection, or something like disaffection, was manifested in Ireland, the influence of the spiritual head of the Roman Catholic Church had been beneficially used for the maintenance of peace and order, he would not shrink from saying that he regarded favourably the use of that influence, though he regretted the necessity which had arisen for its exercise; and he would conclude by stating that, on the present occasion, nothing would be done on his part to prevent that influence being openly and directly accepted whenever necessity demanded it.”

In 1849 Mr. Gladstone spoke more than once in favour of the Clergy Relief Act, “for the relief of persons in holy orders, of the United Church of England and Ireland, declaring their dissent therefrom.” Soon after, on Sir J. Trelawny’s motion for the unconditional abolition of Church Rates, and Sir W. P. Wood’s amendment for exempting Dissenters, Mr. Gladstone said :—

“If the feeling was to abolish simply Church Rates, and not substitute anything in their place, he could understand their supporting this resolution; but those gentlemen who felt differently, were bound to find a substitute.

“While, therefore, he should vote against any and every abstract resolution on the subject, such as had been proposed by the hon. and learned member for Tavistock (Sir J. Trelawny), and by his hon. and learned friend the member for the city of Oxford (Mr. W. P. Wood), yet if his hon. and learned friend

would bring in a Bill embodying his views on the subject, he (Mr. Gladstone) should not vote against its introduction, for he thought that it would be only fair that his hon. and learned friend should have an opportunity of laying his plan on the table of the House. Although he did not approve of that plan, still he admitted that it should be considered. He was neither for that nor any other plan which would do anything to give assent to a resolution which would only remain in mind, and which would show their incapacity of dealing with the natural difficulties of the question, and would also show their incapacity of accomplishing that which they admitted it was most desirable to attain. For the dignity of Parliament, he trusted they would do nothing whatever on that occasion. Their giving their consent to an abstract resolution would only remain as a monument of their hasty conduct."

In 1850 Mr. Gladstone spoke twice on the University Commission; on the latter occasion to this effect:—

"I earnestly hope—I do not yet see reason for abandoning the hope—that the noble lord (J. Russell) will be induced to reconsider an intention hastily conceived, and conceived, as I think, in an evil hour. For the noble lord has heard to-night, in the able speech of my hon. and learned friend the member for Newark (Mr. J. Stuart), of difficulties attaching to this subject, of which, I believe, he had little dreamt at the time he made his unexpected announcement; and, unless I am much mistaken, the noble lord will hear much more with regard to the constitutional—I might almost, if not strictly say—the legal character of the commission he purposes to appoint.

"There is one reason only which makes me regret the necessity which I feel to oppose the whole objects of this commission, and that is, that I am quite certain that any investigation or public examination, such as that which the noble lord would institute, would redound—I do not presume to speak of Cambridge, although I believe the remark would apply with equal force to

that University—would redound to the credit and honour of the body to whom it was applied. Go where you will throughout the country, and nowhere will you find a body of men more competent, more devoted to the functions of their office, or more indefatigable in the application bestowed upon them, more adorned with those virtues which belong—I am sure it is not too much to say—to Christian scholars and gentlemen. I cannot but regret that I should be compelled to oppose an inquiry which, conducted as I know it would be by honourable men, would be certain to elicit testimony so emphatic in favour of the University of Oxford, which, by the few in number only, has been viewed with jealousy and distrust.

“I contend, with regard to the Universities at this moment, no case at all has been made out for inquiry. As matters now stand, there is not the shadow or the pretext of a case for inquiry. I freely tell the noble lord that I do oppose this commission, mainly on the ground of the fears I entertain of the immediate consequences that may result to the Universities. As a precedent that would be acted upon in a different spirit, and in worse times, I have a great dread of this commission, even for the Universities alone; but I mainly object to it from the unconstitutional character which appears to me to attach to the proceeding. For, what is the nature of the inquiry proposed? It is to be the simple act of the executive. The noble lord has shown no anxiety to be advised by the House of Commons.”

On this extract I need not enlarge. Mr. Gladstone himself supplied the only comment it requires, in the year 1854.

On another question, however, the Australian Colonies Bill, Mr. Gladstone not only spoke, but proposed an amendment which he thus explained:—

“All that he designed by the clause in question was to give to the Church of England in the Australian Colonies the very

same power, neither more nor less, and the same means of enforcing it, which were at the present moment possessed and exercised by every other religious body in the Colonies. He asked the House to put aside all ideas gathered from the position of the Church at home, or in the West Indies, or in British North America. What they had to look to was the religious condition of the Australian Colonies; and it was exclusively upon that he addressed the House on the demand which he now made. *It was upon the ground of religious equality* in the first instance, although by no means exclusively, that he wished to have this demand. There was no religious preference worth a straw from one end of the Australian Colonies to the other."

This amendment, lost by 187 to 102, will suffice to show that "religious equality" had come in 1850 to be a familiar phrase with Mr. Gladstone. It is equally certain that, up to 1842, it was in reference to "religious equality" views that Mr. Gladstone wrote—

"It is for the State, for the political society of these Colonies, that reasonable apprehensions may be entertained when they are seen to assume radically false principles as their foundation."

It was in this year also that the famous Pacifico debate occurred, in which Mr. Gladstone summed up his opinion of Lord Palmerston in the following terms:—

"And now I will grapple with the noble lord on the ground which he selected for himself, in the most triumphant portion of his speech, by his reference to those emphatic words, *civis Romanus sum*. What, then, was a Roman citizen? He was the member of a privileged caste; he belonged to a conquering race, to a nation that held all others bound down by the strong arm of power. Is such, then, the view of the noble lord as to

the relation that is to subsist between England and other countries? It is, indeed, too clear, not only from the expressions, but from the whole speech of the noble viscount, that too much of this notion is lurking in his mind; that he adopts, in part, that vain conception, that we, forsooth, have a mission to be the censors of vice and folly, of abuse and imperfection, among the other countries of the world; that we are to be the universal schoolmasters; and that all those who hesitate to recognise our office can be governed only by prejudice or personal animosity, and should have the blind war of diplomacy forthwith declared against them.

"What, sir, ought a Foreign Secretary to be? Is he to be like some gallant knight at a tournament of old, pricking forth into the lists armed at all points, confiding in his sinews and his skill, challenging all comers, for the sake of honour, and having no other duty than to lay as many as possible of his adversaries sprawling in the dust? If such is the idea of a good Foreign Secretary, I, for one, would vote to the noble lord his present appointment for his life.

"It is this insular temper, and this self-glorifying tendency, which the policy of the noble lord and the doctrines of his supporters tend so much to foment, which has given to that policy the quarrelsome character that marks some of their speeches; for, indeed, it seems as if there lay upon the noble lord an absolute necessity for quarrelling. If he can, he will quarrel with an absolute monarchy. If he cannot find an absolute monarchy for the purpose, he will quarrel with one that is limited. If he cannot find even that, yet, sooner than not quarrel at all, he will quarrel with a republic."

In the following words, Lord J. Russell, then Premier, thus expressed himself in regard to Mr. Gladstone:—

"I say that I think it is not a fair course that has been pursued; and if the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) is in

future to conduct the debates in this House on behalf of the great party opposite, I am afraid we must not expect the same fairness and justice from him as we have experienced from the hon. member for Bucks during the time he has been their leader. Let not any man be misled by the notion which the right hon. gentleman, the member for the University of Oxford, stated last night, that, while my noble friend was Foreign Secretary, this country was constantly on the brink of war."

It was shortly after the Pacifico debate that Sir R. Peel died, and his removal, I believe, considerably accelerated Mr. Gladstone's declension towards a fatal decision on the union of Church and State.

In 1850 was published "Historical Remarks on the Royal Supremacy," which has been republished this year. The main argument of this production was sketched out in Mr. Gladstone's first work; but some incidental remarks on page 65 are conceived in a very different spirit—a spirit which shows that in 1850 Mr. Gladstone was looking rather to the propagation of Anglican dogmas than to the preservation of Church and State.

"The State," he wrote, "has guarded with no small vigour—at least, until a very recent period—not the property alone, but the honours, and not the real only, but the imagined privileges and securities of the Church. She has seen men debarred of their civil rights and privileges, because any law conferring them would also confer upon them an influence over her, fit only to be exercised by her members; and she learned with ease, and long retained, and even yet has but half unlearned, the hateful lesson that taught her to rely on these spurious aids, to accept those illusory, and even at length unjust compensations for the silent

decay and overthrow of her natural defences. Anticipating extremes which have not arrived, men already say the blandishments of Delilah have lulled her into soft repose; she awakes at the clank of her fetters, and she finds that the lock of her strength is shorn."

This odd jumble, I need hardly say, is diametrically opposed, both in the spirit and the letter, to the theory of civil disabilities broached in Mr. Gladstone's earliest work, as will appear from Macaulay's criticism before given.

In 1851, however, on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, Mr. Gladstone surpassed even himself in venturing upon the following most extraordinary declaration :—

"My own case is, that I am the only member representing an English University, and a large and important body of the English Clergy, deeply interested in this question, who is to take a course in opposition to the sentiments and judgments of all his colleagues on this question. It is with no sentiments of shame, although with deep regret, that I refer to that difference of opinion; because, while I confess my vote on this Bill will be governed by a regard to the principles of imperial policy, and to the welfare of the entire community, the consideration by which I am led to this conclusion is a consideration which, I am ready to defend and maintain, *is formed with reference to the single interests of the Church of England and its clergy, because, for the reasons given by the hon. baronet, the member for Cavan (Sir J. Young) last night, and for other reasons, I think the House has had some intimation of the view which I am sure is entertained by many, and which I believe is founded in justice and reason—that the true interests of the Clergy of the Church of England and the Church of Ireland are not to be promoted, at this time of day, by pretending to place them between a large body of our fellow-subjects and the fullest enjoyment of religious equality.*"

What have the Clergy to answer to that challenge? Did they return him for Oxford to advocate "the fullest enjoyment of religious equality?" Mr. Gladstone proceeded amid interruptions, thus marked in Hansard:—" (cries of 'Oh! oh!')," (ironical cries of 'Hear!')," " (cries of 'Oh! oh!')," " ('Oh!' and 'No, no!')," and, among other ejaculations, exclaimed—

"We cannot turn back the tendencies of the age towards religious liberty."

Ultimately the second reading of the Bill was carried by no less than 438 to 95. Of whom was that 95 composed? Besides the two tellers (the Earl of Arundel and Surrey and Mr. J. Reynolds), and other Romanists, that 95 included Sir J. Graham, Sir. J. Walmisley, Messrs. Gladstone, S. Herbert, Cardwell, Milner Gibson, W. J. Fox, Hume, Bright, and Fergus O'Connor—a motley collection of Romanists, Anglicans, democratic Radicals and Chartists, and including all the Anti-State Church clique in the House of Commons. This is the level, however, to which Mr. Gladstone seems not unlikely to gravitate permanently.

In 1852 Lord J. Russell's ministry was succeeded by Lord Derby's, which Mr. Gladstone, for reasons now better understood, probably, declined to join. In the autumn of the same year the Conservative ministry was ejected on the Budget, and Mr. Gladstone failed not to repay Mr. Disraeli for his sarcasms of 1845. The whole speech is well worth perusal, as a sample of pure Glad-

stonism; but it is, for the most part, foreign to our contemplations.

Previous, however, to the Budget scene there had occurred another, of the following description:—On proposing the second reading of the Colonial Bishops Bill, the object of which was similar to that of the amendment of 1850 on the Australian Bill, Mr. Gladstone thus spoke:—

“The principle upon which the Bill proceeds is that which, I am happy to see, is daily gaining strength, favour, and currency in this country—namely, that of leaving the Colonies, subject to any restraints needful upon imperial grounds, to the uncontrolled management of their own local affairs, whether it be for ecclesiastical or for civil purposes.

Again, as regards the religious opinions of others, the very last object which I could entertain would be to trench in any degree upon the religious liberty of members of other communions; for I frankly state, in the face of the House of Commons, that if any man offers me for the Church of England in the Colonies the boon of civil preference, I would reject that boon, not necessarily as ill-intended or ill-minded, but undoubtedly as a fatal gift, because I am convinced that any such preference would be nothing but a source of weakness to the Church herself, and of discord and difficulty to the Colonial communities, in the soil of which I am anxious to see the Church of England take a free, strong, and healthy root. I must not attempt to disguise from the House that *the principle upon which I ask the House to proceed with reference to this Bill is that of Religious Equality*. If I am asked how I can justify such a course with my duties to a constituency formed in great part of the clergy of the Established Church, I say at once that it is my paramount duty to promote, by every means in my power, the interests of that religious system to which they

belong ; and I feel convinced, after not a brief study of Colonial affairs, that I should be taking a course detrimental and ruinous to those interests if I were to refrain from recognising, or hesitate to recognise, any measure for the Church of England in the Colonies which had not for its basis the principle of perfect religious equality as the principle of Colonial legislation. I hope I have made it so perfectly clear, in disavowing and disclaiming the gift, if offered, of civil preference, that it is not necessary for me to say more upon the subject, except to invite hon. members to assist me in excluding from the measure which I have to propose, any provisions which could tend in the slightest degree to a departure from that principle of religious equality."

Here, again, "religious equality" is advocated, and in the interest, ostensibly, of the Church of England in the Colonies. The tone of the whole speech, however, indicates a design to place the Church of England in opposition to the Established Church of England, as if implying that the latter would compromise the former—that the temporalities, indeed, would impede and obstruct the spiritualities.

Let us now see what the Gladstonian theory was in regard to the Colonies and religion, up to 1842.

"We have stated no opinion as to the manner in which, under the difficult and peculiar circumstances of our Colonies, the functions of Government in respect to a State religion ought to be discharged, or the principles laid down in the foregoing inquiry saved. But thus much it is right to say : there ought not to be *that positive contravention of such principles, that active participation in evil*, which in some, at least, of these cases there unfortunately has been. It is one thing to mark wisely the

limits of our real powers, to disavow all compulsion, to aid that which we hold to be true, and for the rest, where we can do no more, under protest to permit; *but it is another thing to confound the boundary lines of truth and falsehood, to concur in, to promote, to originate measures which may fall in with the inclinations of the day, but which, being intrinsically vicious, though they may yield a harvest of present popularity, are also the seeds of certain evil for the future.* If the democratic characteristics and tendencies of these colonies, taken together with the religious differences of the inhabitants, prevent their enjoying the benefit of the nationality of the Church, these circumstances may be resistless; but let us, at least, see and describe them as they are, and instead of puffing ourselves with a false theory, contrived to flatter our self-love, let us honestly recognise in the causes an evil, in the result a misfortune."

In discussing the measure of 1852, however, on a subsequent occasion, Mr. Gladstone having exhibited anything but a wise, or considerate, or genial, or friendly, or confiding temper towards Sir J. Pakington, then Colonial Secretary, was constrained to offer the following atonement:—

"I have only one word to offer on a personal matter between the right hon. gentleman and myself. I must confess that, for the first time during 20 years of public life, I did feel very greatly aggrieved by the tone which the right hon. gentleman adopted, as I thought, in his speech on a former occasion. The language which he has used to-day, however, convinces me that I was mistaken, and that I ought entirely to waive that feeling. His motives I have never doubted or questioned; and I confess that I ought to regard his language as lying within the fair latitude and license of debate. That being so, and not being fond of quarrel, I wish spontaneously to say, that I entirely withdraw

any words that I may have used, that were in any degree painful to the right hon. gentleman. I regret having used them, and I trust that, in discussing either this or any other measure in this House, I may never give cause of offence to any hon. member."

The Government of "all the talents," as it was termed, succeeded, and it would have been as well, perhaps, if they had only acted as did the servant in the parable with his talent—if they had simply kept their talents laid up in a napkin.

Among the first measures of that Ministry was one to enable the Canadian Legislature to control the appropriation of the Clergy Reserves. It was well known that the object in view was to disturb the settlement of 1791, and its confirmatory settlement of 1840, and Mr. F. Peel himself, on introducing the measure, tolled the death-knell of both, in the following strain:—

"On the part of the Government I disclaim it being brought forward in any unfriendly spirit towards the Church of England. *No doubt the concession that we propose to make does shake the confidence which is now felt in the perpetuity of the fund as an endowment for religious purposes.* But, regarding the Church of England as a body of individual clergy in that country, we have taken ample guarantees for their continued enjoyment of the stipends now allotted to them, and we have the full concurrence of the Legislature and the Executive of Canada in doing so. We have inserted a clause in this Bill which will render it impossible for those clergy to be deprived of their emoluments, so long as they live or continue in their incumbencies."

Even Lord J. Russell protested that he introduced

the Bill of 1840 in the hope that its equitable provisions would prove satisfactory for a long time to the people of Canada, and that no attempt would be made to disturb that settlement, and that he even then doubted whether the Legislature of Canada was wise in wishing to disturb that settlement. Mr. Gladstone, however, as was to be expected from his speech on the Colonial Bishops' Bill, the year preceding, threw himself, with more than wonted ardour, into the assault on the Clergy Reserves, creating a diversion by arguing that—

“The question is really not about the use that shall be made of the power, but about the hands in which, if right, it should be lodged.”

Subsequently, he fell upon his own colleague in the following style :—

“I heard with surprise the observations of my right hon. friend and colleague the other night, and I cannot sympathize with him in his fears that those endowments will be touched ; *for my firm hope is, that, if you pass this Bill, those endowments will be maintained* (Laughter). Do you think there is wisdom in that laugh ? Do you think the chance of their being maintained is increased by ridiculing the very idea that the Canadian Parliament may be disposed to maintain them ? For my part I must say that I happen to know, from the opinions of persons in Canada entitled to the greatest weight—of persons whose judgment and opportunities of forming judgment are excellent, and whose powers of mind give the greatest value to their conclusions—that they do believe that those endowments will be respected. I may be wrong ; but I sincerely believe that your concession to the people of Canada in this vital matter, by giving

them the power of dealing with their own affairs, accompanied with the respectful expression of British feeling in favour of the maintenance of those endowments, without pretence to authority, but simply as being the unrestrained expressions of your feelings, will, at all events, afford the best chance of securing them."

Finally, Mr. Gladstone made the now stereotyped appeal :—

"I recommend this Bill to the House because it is wise, politic, and prudent ; but, above all, I emphatically recommend it because it is righteous and just."

Now, in reply to that speech, I would refer the reader to Mr. Gladstone's views in 1840 ; and perhaps Mr. Gladstone himself will be good enough to say whether Mr. F. Peel's anticipations or his own have proved the more correct, notwithstanding "the opinions of persons in Canada entitled to the greatest weight," &c., &c. It only remains to add, that the Bill of 1853 was brought in by Mr. F. Peel, Lord J. Russell, and Sir W. Molesworth, and that, among its leading supporters, besides Mr. Gladstone, were Sir J. Walmisley, Messrs. W. J. Fox, Heywood, Bright, Hume, and Miall—A man, saith the proverb, *noscitur a sociis*.

Strange and eventful as are Mr. Gladstone's annals, it may be doubted whether the records of 1854 do not surpass all that went before or that have followed after. His speech of 1834, and the more recent manifesto in 1850, relative to the Universities, are not, I trust, forgotten. As fate decreed, it fell to Mr. Gladstone's lot in

1854 to give effect, as a Cabinet Minister, to the declarations of previous years. Let us now inquire in what way he fulfilled the hopes he had inspired.

On introducing the Oxford University Bill, based upon the Commission of 1850, on the 17th March, Lord J. Russell remarked :—

“I have likewise had the very great advantage of the assistance of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the member for the University of Oxford, in the preparation of the Bill which I am about to ask the House to give me leave to introduce.”

On the second reading (April 7th) Mr. Gladstone also thus spoke :—

“My noble friend (Lord J. Russell) stated his opinion in favour of the admission of Dissenters to education and honours in the University of Oxford, but stated at the same time his intention to vote against any proposition for inserting such provisions in the present Bill. I, following the noble lord, likewise stated I should give a similar vote.”

Subsequently (June 22), Mr. Heywood proposed as an addition to the Bill, Clause 1, to the effect,

“That, from and after the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it should not be necessary for any person, upon matriculation at the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or take any oath, except the oath of allegiance or an equivalent declaration.”

On this motion Mr. Gladstone delivered himself as follows :—

“There is great force in much of what the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Henley) has urged, and all the more, if I interpreted

correctly the cheers which reached my ears from one quarter of the House, following some of his observations, and which cheers I interpreted to mean, that *this vote is intended to be the first of a series of Parliamentary interferences by which the system of religious instruction in the University is intended to be altogether broken down.* It may be all very well for the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. Gibson) to say that on this occasion he discards altogether the question of the Established Church. If I were to adopt the proposition of the right hon. gentleman, I should feel that the next step which it would be incumbent upon me to take would be the rather difficult one of making application for the Chiltern Hundreds, that I might either exclude myself from Parliament, or seek the suffrages of some other constituency. I hold the relative position of the Church and of the University of Oxford to be this: that, while the Church is in the position of a national establishment, so long as the people of this country insist on a connexion being maintained between religion and education, so long the Church is entitled to expect that the interests of the University, that the discipline of the University, that the government of the University, shall be moulded in conformity with the principles of religion, and with the principles of religion in that specific form in which they are held and taught by the Church of England.

“I would not go so far as to say that it appears to me a line ought to be drawn between admission to the University itself and admission to the endowments of the University. If a line were drawn at all, it ought, perhaps, to exclude those endowments that are connected with the government of the University. But with reference to the other classes of endowment, such as exhibitions and bursaries—endowments that do not partake of any connexion with the government of the University—I would place them on the same level with access to the University itself.

“In 1850 my noble friend, then at the head of the Government, drew a distinction between the question of University Reform and the admission of Dissenters to the University. Up

1854 to give effect, as a Cabinet Minister, to the declarations of previous years. Let us now inquire in what way he fulfilled the hopes he had inspired.

On introducing the Oxford University Bill, based upon the Commission of 1850, on the 17th March, Lord J. Russell remarked :—

“I have likewise had the very great advantage of the assistance of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the member for the University of Oxford, in the preparation of the Bill which I am about to ask the House to give me leave to introduce.”

On the second reading (April 7th) Mr. Gladstone also thus spoke :—

“My noble friend (Lord J. Russell) stated his opinion in favour of the admission of Dissenters to education and honours in the University of Oxford, but stated at the same time his intention to vote against any proposition for inserting such provisions in the present Bill. I, following the noble lord, likewise stated I should give a similar vote.”

Subsequently (June 22), Mr. Heywood proposed as an addition to the Bill, Clause 1, to the effect,

“That, from and after the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it should not be necessary for any person, upon matriculation at the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or take any oath, except the oath of allegiance or an equivalent declaration.”

On this motion Mr. Gladstone delivered himself as follows :—

“There is great force in much of what the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Henley) has urged, and all the more, if I interpreted

correctly the cheers which reached my ears from one quarter of the House, following some of his observations, and which cheers I interpreted to mean, that *this vote is intended to be the first of a series of Parliamentary interferences by which the system of religious instruction in the University is intended to be altogether broken down*. It may be all very well for the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. Gibson) to say that on this occasion he discards altogether the question of the Established Church. If I were to adopt the proposition of the right hon. gentleman, I should feel that the next step which it would be incumbent upon me to take would be the rather difficult one of making application for the Chiltern Hundreds, that I might either exclude myself from Parliament, or seek the suffrages of some other constituency. I hold the relative position of the Church and of the University of Oxford to be this: that, while the Church is in the position of a national establishment, so long as the people of this country insist on a connexion being maintained between religion and education, so long the Church is entitled to expect that the interests of the University, that the discipline of the University, that the government of the University, shall be moulded in conformity with the principles of religion, and with the principles of religion in that specific form in which they are held and taught by the Church of England.

“I would not go so far as to say that it appears to me a line ought to be drawn between admission to the University itself and admission to the endowments of the University. If a line were drawn at all, it ought, perhaps, to exclude those endowments that are connected with the government of the University. But with reference to the other classes of endowment, such as exhibitions and bursaries—endowments that do not partake of any connexion with the government of the University—I would place them on the same level with access to the University itself.

“In 1850 my noble friend, then at the head of the Government, drew a distinction between the question of University Reform and the admission of Dissenters to the University. Up

1854 to give effect, as a Cabinet Minister, to the declarations of previous years. Let us now inquire in what way he fulfilled the hopes he had inspired.

On introducing the Oxford University Bill, based upon the Commission of 1850, on the 17th March, Lord J. Russell remarked :—

“I have likewise had the very great advantage of the assistance of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the member for the University of Oxford, in the preparation of the Bill which I am about to ask the House to give me leave to introduce.”

On the second reading (April 7th) Mr. Gladstone also thus spoke :—

“My noble friend (Lord J. Russell) stated his opinion in favour of the admission of Dissenters to education and honours in the University of Oxford, but stated at the same time his intention to vote against any proposition for inserting such provisions in the present Bill. I, following the noble lord, likewise stated I should give a similar vote.”

Subsequently (June 22), Mr. Heywood proposed as an addition to the Bill, Clause 1, to the effect,

“That, from and after the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it should not be necessary for any person, upon matriculation at the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or take any oath, except the oath of allegiance or an equivalent declaration.”

On this motion Mr. Gladstone delivered himself as follows :—

“There is great force in much of what the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Henley) has urged, and all the more, if I interpreted

correctly the cheers which reached my ears from one quarter of the House, following some of his observations, and which cheers I interpreted to mean, that *this vote is intended to be the first of a series of Parliamentary interferences by which the system of religious instruction in the University is intended to be altogether broken down.* It may be all very well for the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. Gibson) to say that on this occasion he discards altogether the question of the Established Church. If I were to adopt the proposition of the right hon. gentleman, I should feel that the next step which it would be incumbent upon me to take would be the rather difficult one of making application for the Chiltern Hundreds, that I might either exclude myself from Parliament, or seek the suffrages of some other constituency. I hold the relative position of the Church and of the University of Oxford to be this: that, while the Church is in the position of a national establishment, so long as the people of this country insist on a connexion being maintained between religion and education, so long the Church is entitled to expect that the interests of the University, that the discipline of the University, that the government of the University, shall be moulded in conformity with the principles of religion, and with the principles of religion in that specific form in which they are held and taught by the Church of England.

“I would not go so far as to say that it appears to me a line ought to be drawn between admission to the University itself and admission to the endowments of the University. If a line were drawn at all, it ought, perhaps, to exclude those endowments that are connected with the government of the University. But with reference to the other classes of endowment, such as exhibitions and bursaries—endowments that do not partake of any connexion with the government of the University—I would place them on the same level with access to the University itself.

“In 1850 my noble friend, then at the head of the Government, drew a distinction between the question of University Reform and the admission of Dissenters to the University. Up

to the present time the Government undoubtedly have kept the two questions separate. By doing so, I am free to own we have now the acquiescence, the assent, the warm and intelligent support of many members of the University of Oxford, whose support has enabled us to carry the Bill thus far; and I do hope my hon. friend (Mr. Heywood) will feel (at least, speaking for myself as one deeply interested in the progress of the measure I should feel) that I was making a most unworthy return for that support, were I to assent to a change so vital at the last moment, after the provisions of the Bill have been so thoroughly discussed—now, on the bringing up of the Report, were I to assent to a change so vital, so essential, and so unexpected from all that the Government have hitherto said and done on the subject. That, however, is a matter which I freely admit affects the position of the Government rather than the duty of this House. I, at least, as an individual, feel that it would be an ill return for us to make for the support we have hitherto received from Oxford—support which we should never have had, unless we had kept separate those two questions, and without which support, I own, I am perfectly satisfied we never should have been able to induce the House to accede to the propositions contained in this Bill.

“ My right hon. friend the Secretary-at-War referred—and I thought with considerable force—to the probable result of my hon. friend’s achievement, supposing him to succeed in inducing this House to adopt his Clauses, and to send the Bill, with these Clauses annexed, to the House of Lords. My hon. friend may say, as the right hon. member for Manchester (Mr. M. Gibson) has said, ‘ I do not care what the House of Lords may do; the Bill may be lost without regret—we shall get a better Bill next year.’ It may be all very well for the right hon. gentleman (Mr. M. Gibson) to come forward and say, ‘ Don’t let us be intimidated by the House of Lords. What would have come of all the good measures if we had waited till the House of Lords had come up to the standard of those measures?’ I do not think that it was by violence, or by overawing the House of

Lords, that the good measures of the last 20 years have been carried. I believe that it was by the judicious forbearance of this House, by its good feeling, by its watching times and seasons, by its sedulous attention to every opportunity that prudence dictated. It was in this way, and not by violence, that those measures were carried.

"I fear that great mischief will be done if my hon. friend's motion is successful—if his Clauses are incorporated in this Bill. I certainly think that the greatest mischief will result if these Clauses are incorporated in the Bill. You may say, though the Bill is rejected now, we shall get a better measure next year. I don't think, if this Bill is rejected, that you will get another Bill next year, or the year after that. But the mischief will not stop here. It will alienate the minds of many members in the University who might have been disposed to forward this object.

"You will, in the first place, and needlessly, do the mischief of applying the strong hand of centralizing power to override the local academical rights of the University of Oxford; and, in the second place, you will find that this wanton exercise of power is also an imprudent and a useless exercise of power, and that, after you have brandished the whip in the face of the University, you must still depend upon its good-will; because your enactment, unless by the good-will of a free University, will be useless for the purposes which you have in view."

Eventually Mr. Heywood's Clause 1 was carried against Government by 252 to 161. Upon this Mr. Heywood proposed Clause 2 to the effect,

"That, from and after the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it shall not be necessary for any person, upon taking any of the degrees in Arts, Law, or Medicine, usually conferred by the said University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or to take any oath, save the oath of allegiance or an equivalent declaration."

1854 to give effect, as a Cabinet Minister, to the declarations of previous years. Let us now inquire in what way he fulfilled the hopes he had inspired.

On introducing the Oxford University Bill, based upon the Commission of 1850, on the 17th March, Lord J. Russell remarked :—

“I have likewise had the very great advantage of the assistance of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the member for the University of Oxford, in the preparation of the Bill which I am about to ask the House to give me leave to introduce.”

On the second reading (April 7th) Mr. Gladstone also thus spoke :—

“My noble friend (Lord J. Russell) stated his opinion in favour of the admission of Dissenters to education and honours in the University of Oxford, but stated at the same time his intention to vote against any proposition for inserting such provisions in the present Bill. I, following the noble lord, likewise stated I should give a similar vote.”

Subsequently (June 22), Mr. Heywood proposed as an addition to the Bill, Clause 1, to the effect,

“That, from and after the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it should not be necessary for any person, upon matriculation at the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration, or take any oath, except the oath of allegiance or an equivalent declaration.”

On this motion Mr. Gladstone delivered himself as follows :—

“There is great force in much of what the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Henley) has urged, and all the more, if I interpreted

correctly the cheers which reached my ears from one quarter of the House, following some of his observations, and which cheers I interpreted to mean, that *this vote is intended to be the first of a series of Parliamentary interferences by which the system of religious instruction in the University is intended to be altogether broken down*. It may be all very well for the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. Gibson) to say that on this occasion he discards altogether the question of the Established Church. If I were to adopt the proposition of the right hon. gentleman, I should feel that the next step which it would be incumbent upon me to take would be the rather difficult one of making application for the Chiltern Hundreds, that I might either exclude myself from Parliament, or seek the suffrages of some other constituency. I hold the relative position of the Church and of the University of Oxford to be this: that, while the Church is in the position of a national establishment, so long as the people of this country insist on a connexion being maintained between religion and education, so long the Church is entitled to expect that the interests of the University, that the discipline of the University, that the government of the University, shall be moulded in conformity with the principles of religion, and with the principles of religion in that specific form in which they are held and taught by the Church of England.

“I would not go so far as to say that it appears to me a line ought to be drawn between admission to the University itself and admission to the endowments of the University. If a line were drawn at all, it ought, perhaps, to exclude those endowments that are connected with the government of the University. But with reference to the other classes of endowment, such as exhibitions and bursaries—endowments that do not partake of any connexion with the government of the University—I would place them on the same level with access to the University itself.

“In 1850 my noble friend, then at the head of the Government, drew a distinction between the question of University Reform and the admission of Dissenters to the University. Up

"We are about," said Mr. Gladstone, "to ask only for such an amount, which, though it may seem large to some gentlemen, we feel convinced is the smallest by which, under the most favourable circumstances, we can hope to see those gallant forces, now leaving our shores, brought back *after the completion of the object for which they are sent*. Taking these forces in round numbers at 25,000 men, we propose to ask the Committee to vote a sum of money for the purpose of extraordinary military service, at the rate of £50 per head, or a sum of £1,250,000."

It was in 1854 that Mr. Gladstone also threw out the following hints, as the basis of an adjustment of the Church Rate question :—

"I quite agree that the case for a change in the law of Church Rates is an irresistible case. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the strength of the obligation incumbent on the Government to take this question into its view. I think the first reason why the law of Church Rates ought to be altered is this, that it tends to weaken the foundation of all law, in a country where you have an admitted obligation existing, without the adequate means for its enforcement. Now there is no doubt about the legal obligation. So far as I am acquainted with the documents and facts connected with the Braintree case, I believe that the very judgment which defeated the means of carrying it out, reiterated and confirmed the declaration of the legal obligation. Well, that is a state of things which ought not to continue; we ought either to bring the means of enforcement up to the standard of the legal obligation, or else we should reduce the standard of legal obligation down to the point where it will admit of enforcement.

"Now, I must confess it appears true that there is much to be said in favour of some plan that has for its main objects a division between that class of parishes where the law of Church Rates works well, and the class of parishes where it works ill.

I should not proceed by drawing an absolute distinction between parishes with over a certain population and parishes with below a certain population. I rather would take the state of facts that we have got before us, in which we practically find that there are a portion of the parishes in which the rate-payers are averse to Church Rates, and a greater proportion in which the rate-payers acquiesce in and give effect to Church Rates. It is practically referred to the choice of the rate-payers already. I should be content to refer the matter to their choice by law. Now, suppose it were so referred, and made competent to the rate-payers in a parish, by a declaration or act come to and registered in due legal form, to place that parish outside the operation of the law of Church Rates, how would such a plan work? I confess that my opinion, my hope, I would rather say, is, that that plan would work by leaving the rural parishes of the country very much as they are now—that the great bulk of them would continue as they do now, to levy and pay Church Rates. How would it work in cases where the rate is now refused? Why, it would give to the parishes a legal title to that which they now enjoy *de facto*, but enjoy undoubtedly with very questionable legality.”

I know not whether any comment may be expected upon the above; but, if so, I refer to that of the Liberation Society in 1855, which ran to the merry tune,

“That local resistance to Church Rates continues to extend, and that, stimulated by the suggestion of Mr. Gladstone, the inhabitants of small towns, and even villages, have carried their opposition to a poll—in many instances with unexpected success, and in all, to the advancement of principles destined to effect changes of a graver kind.”

Another question for which Mr. Gladstone spoke and

voted this session was an Oaths Bill, brought in by Lord J. Russell, and designed specially to gratify political Dissenters, Romanists, and Jews. Accordingly, it was also supported by Messrs. Cobden, Bright, and Miall, *et hoc genus omne*, but lost by 251 to 247.

On Mr. T. Chambers' motion for inquiring into conventual and monastic institutions, Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues were also defeated by 186 to 119.

There remains another measure of 1854, Mr. Gladstone's share in which appears to have been wholly overlooked. I refer to the Reform Bill of that year, to which, containing proposals for a £6 borough and £10 county franchise, as well as for certain "fancy franchises," and the transference of over sixty seats, he nevertheless gave his, I suppose, deliberate assent. This, too, was Mr. Gladstone's first essay at Reform. However, the Russian War cut short that first promise—no unworthy prelude to the "Chartism" of 1864.

In 1855 the Coalition Ministry, having been defeated on Mr. Roebuck's motion, by 305 to 148, resigned. Lord Derby was again invited to form a government, and endeavoured to obtain the co-operation of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. S. Herbert, and Lord Palmerston. Ultimately, all declined to join Lord Derby; and shortly after, Lord Palmerston himself formed a ministry, being joined by all the Gladstone clique. Within a week, however, the latter withdrew from the Ministry. Subsequently, on a motion of Mr. Heywood's, "to consider such clauses of the Act of Uniformity as

impose religious tests," Mr. Gladstone laid down the following admirable *dicta* :—

"He felt bound to give notice to his hon. friend, that, so far as the University of Oxford was concerned, after the arrangement of last year, he (Mr. Gladstone) would think it his duty, without the smallest compunction or hesitation, to resist any attempt to interfere with the settlement then made by Parliament. He thought that any alteration of important Acts of Parliament, which might unsettle the condition of ancient institutions, was a matter of very serious consideration, and that it was most inexpedient and unadvisable that the discussion of such subjects should be renewed year after year. No doubt it appeared to his hon. friend a very slight thing to cut out of the Statute Book any measures which were opposed to his views of the manner in which these venerable institutions should be regulated. He (Mr. Gladstone), *however, thought that in the case of institutions so ancient, and possessing so many rights of a complex character, a strong case was requisite to justify the interference of Parliament, and it was especially desirable that such interference should be rare.*"

In 1857 Mr. Gladstone supported Mr. Cobden's motion on China, giving utterance to some remarks which seem even more applicable to the Danish Debate of 1864.

"I will ask," he said, "what the effect will be throughout the world, if it goes forth that in the debates held in the two Houses of Parliament, the majority of speakers condemned the proceedings, and that, even among those who sustained the Government with their vote, there was a large number who condemned these proceedings."

Two days after, on the ministerial statement, Mr. Gladstone's indignation found vent in these strains :—

"Sir, most anxious as I am, in common with the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) to afford every just and reasonable facility for putting forward the public business, I frankly own that I am not prepared to abdicate the essential duties of the House of Commons. The House of Commons has been wronged; its rights and privileges have already been disparaged by the Government. They commenced a war with Persia, and they began hostilities in China, without the authority of Parliament. It is not the duty of Parliament to allow these things to proceed, and then to have a Bill rendered, and be told, 'There is the charge.' The destinies of this great empire are at the disposal of men whom no considerations of justice or sound policy restrain," &c.

In the second session of 1857 Mr. Gladstone thus spoke on the second reading of the Divorce Bill:—

"I resist this measure conscientiously. If I have spoken warmly on the subject, it is because it has offended my own conscientious feelings. I resist this measure because I believe it to be a retrograde step, and pregnant with the most dangerous consequences to our social interests, in that it tends to bring us back again towards a state of laxity which Christianity does not recognise. I resist this measure because I believe it is not desired by the people of this country. I object to it because it contains a proposal harsh and unjust towards the ministers of religion, but still more so, because the assumption of this function by the sole authority of Parliament involves an insult to what is far higher than the ministers of religion—namely, to religion itself. And, although what I may do may be utterly powerless in arresting its progress, at least I am determined, so far as it depends upon me, that I will be responsible for no part of the consequences that may result from a measure fraught, as I believe it to be, with danger to the highest interests of religion and the morality of the people."

Such was the opinion of Mr. Gladstone, in 1857, of the measures and men from whom, within two years, he accepted office, and with whom he has continued to act ever since.

In 1858, when Lord Palmerston was defeated on the Conspiracy Bill, and resigned in consequence, Mr. Gladstone gave his speech and vote against him, but not in such trenchant terms as in 1850, on the Pacifico question. Subsequently, on two occasions, he spoke on Church Rates; on the former, to the effect that

“The Church Rates, if abolished, will go into the pockets of the landlords. I think the people of England, who generally contrive to solve awkward problems by the exercise of practical good sense rather than by theory, have attained the desirable object of solving even the problem of Church Rates in such a manner that, though it does not obviate everything disagreeable, yet removes all really unfriendly symptoms; for I commonly see that, after there has been a motion for a Church Rate, an amendment against it, and a poll, the meeting generally breaks up in good humour, and with a vote of thanks to the chairman. I must say that although this ‘religious war’ figures very well in speeches in Parliament, I should not feel that I had done anything to keep up bad blood by sanctioning the short continuance of the present system (three years) proposed by my hon. friend (Sir A. Elton).”

On the latter occasion, Mr. Gladstone said :—

“He could not but feel that a portion of the difficulties of this question had arisen from the disposition which was entertained, and entertained, perhaps, more extensively than it was avowed, though it was explicitly avowed in evidence, namely, to *fight the question of a Church Establishment upon the ground of*

Church Rates. In his opinion the question assumed an entirely different aspect, according as they proposed a measure with the sincere intention of making it a cure for a practical grievance, and according as the claimants for abolition used it to cover and screen ulterior objects for which they thought the time was not yet arrived more explicitly to avoid. Ever since the proposition which Sir W. P. Wood made some ten years ago, to except Dissenters from the payment of Church Rates, he had never scrupled to declare himself favourable to that exemption. Was the law of Church Rates bad? He contended that it was founded upon a popular basis, because it intrusted to the majority of the parishioners the business of satisfying their local wants. Was it a novel principle? On the contrary, it was founded on an ancient law, and it established a local supervision, in a manner most agreeable to English feelings. It was useless to disguise that the Bill would in many cases throw a heavy burden upon the clergyman. Its direct effect would be to destroy the maintenance of the Church in certain cases, and in others to take their daily bread out of the mouths of the incumbents. He agreed that the time had arrived when the Bill might well proceed to the other House; they would then see whether the greatest landowners in England would relieve themselves and their posterity from ancient and hereditary taxation."

Whether Mr. Gladstone had or had not approved of exemption from 1849, it is certain that his speech of 1837 insisted upon something very different. In his work, also, upon the State's Relations with the Church, he had thus treated the question :—

"We have ever contended in England that Dissenters are bound to pay Church Rates, irrespective of their approval or disapproval of that worship which such payments are intended to maintain."

In the same year Mr. Gladstone also approved of the Government policy in the Cagliari affair, and in the autumn accepted a mission to the Ionian Islands, where his episcopal *mania* found freer development than in England.

In 1859 Mr. Gladstone supported both the Government Church Rate Bill and their Reform Bill, though not approving of the latter entirely. The following extracts, however, are curious on other grounds, and as taken from the first Reform speech Mr. Gladstone ever uttered :—

“I begin by frankly admitting that I concur, I am sorry to say, in very nearly everything that has been said against the Bill. I cannot be a party to the disfranchisement of the county freeholders residing in boroughs. I cannot be a party to the uniformity of the franchise. I cannot be a party to a Reform Bill which does not lower the suffrage in boroughs. *I may go a step farther and say, it appears to me that the lowering of the suffrage in boroughs is the main purpose of having a Reform Bill, and that, unless we are to have that lowering of the suffrage, it would be better that we should not waste our time on this subject.* But I must make a concession on the part of the Bill. I feel bound in honour to say that, upon the whole, I cannot help approving that portion of the Bill relating to the re-distribution of seats. I think that it is an improvement upon the measure to which I was myself a party in 1854. This is no small or trifling matter. In point of fact, the question of the re-distribution of seats is a full half of your whole Reform Bill; the re-distribution of seats and the arrangement of the franchise make up the measure.

“I must frankly own, it appears true that to proceed far in the disfranchisement of small boroughs is a course injurious to the

efficiency of the House of Commons. You must not consider in this matter the question only of the electors: you must consider quite as much who are likely to be the elected. And permit me to say that the time has come when, in the examination of any scheme of Reform, it is of vital and capital importance that this matter should be brought fully under the view of the House.

"We have heard, in the course of this debate, some apology for small constituencies. Well, I am no great lover of small constituencies, and it never was my lot to sit for one. At the same time, small constituencies undoubtedly tend to answer the great purpose of a representative system in securing its diversity and completeness. If you have nothing but large and populous bodies to return your members of Parliament, then, as recent experience seems—I am sorry to say, in a great degree to prove—local interests and local influences will, upon the whole, prevail, and you will not find it possible to introduce adequately into this House the race of men by whom the Government of the country is to be carried on.

"Many, however, have spoken on behalf of small boroughs. I want to speak on behalf of a certain description of small boroughs—of those where, from kindly interest, from ancient and affectionate recollections, from local and traditional respect, from the memory of services received, from the admiration of great men and great qualities, the constituencies are willing to take upon trust the recommendation of candidates for Parliament from noblemen or gentlemen who may stand in immediate connexion with them. (Some cries of 'Oh!') I do not complain at all of that interruption. I admit that there is something of paradox in such an argument upon such a question, if it is to be considered as an argument upon paper only; but practice has proved that the real paradox lies with those who will allow of no ingress into this House but one. If that one ingress is to be the suffrages of a large mass of voters, the consequence is a dead level of mediocrity, which destroys not only the ornament but the force of this House, and which, as I think the history of

other countries will show, is ultimately fatal to the liberties of the people."

This speech, it will be seen, deals out Conservative and Liberal ideas consecutively, with all the impartiality of a man ready for either party, but bent upon joining the winning side. How Lord J. Russell carried his factious resolution against the Reform Bill of 1859, and so precipitated another dissolution, is well known. For the present, therefore, we will again suspend the narrative, to take a retrospect of events since 1847.

Chequered as were the destinies of Mr. Gladstone between 1847 and 1859, and confused as are the materials for forming an estimate of the general result, it is still possible, I think, to educe order out of that chaos. That the speech of 1845 on the Maynooth Grant, in which the exclusive system of State connexion was first abandoned, was aggravated by that of 1847, on Jewish Disabilities, cannot be doubted. But in 1851, on the Ecclesiastical Titles' Bill, Mr. Gladstone laid down, even more plainly, the dogma of "religious equality," as being, "at this time of day," most conducive to the interests both of the clergy and the Church of England. It is only fair, however, to note that, as in 1847 he stated that he neither contemplated nor desired "organic change in the connexion between the Church and the State," so, his theory of "religious equality" seems, on the whole, to have assumed the form rather of endowing than disendowing all religions. At all

events, this is the conclusion I have come to with respect to England.

In the Colonies, however, there can be no question that Mr. Gladstone not only contemplated, but desired "religious equality" of another order—that form which consists in disestablishing all sects, or in having none established. This much is abundantly proved by the speeches of 1851, 1852, and 1853, on colonial matters. By consenting to the exemption of Dissenters, however, on the Church Rate question, Mr. Gladstone had taken one step towards that ulterior form of "religious equality" in England.

In truth, the marked feature of his career between 1847 and 1859 is that of perpetual oscillation between these two systems of "religious equality." Sometimes the exclusive rights of the Church were maintained, as in 1850, on the University Commission; sometimes these rights were absolutely and unconditionally surrendered to Dissent, as in the case of Church Rates; sometimes, as in the University Bill of 1854, Mr. Gladstone flattered himself that, though yielding to Dissent, he was not injuring the Church.

One general rule, however, may be stated, that Mr. Gladstone uniformly spoke and voted in behalf of every concession to Romanism, as was shown in 1847, 1848, 1851, and 1854. It is possible, indeed, that in so doing he considered that, while relieving and aiding Popery, he was, nevertheless, free from, at least, active hostility against the Established Church. It might be also, that

he preferred to uphold dogma to upholding the union of Church and State.

One singular habit of Mr. Gladstone's was his practice of appealing to his position as member for Oxford University. Between 1847 and 1859 his seat was twice contested. On both occasions, as well as in 1847, he was returned on the strength of future expectations based upon past experience. Had he openly committed himself, on any single election, to the course subsequently pursued, Mr. Gladstone would never, I maintain, have sat for the University of Oxford. Yet, whenever any question came before Parliament upon which his views were most opposed to those of the University, upon such occasions Mr. Gladstone made it a constant practice to endeavour to add weight to his authority by direct reference to his sitting for Oxford University. The morality of such a course I leave to his friends to vindicate.

When out of office it may be said that Mr. Gladstone opposed every Government in turn; but to no individual was he more hostile than to Lord Palmerston. At four different times, however, he refused to join a Conservative ministry, between 1847 and 1859. In fact, after Sir R. Peel's death Mr. Gladstone ran some risk of utter isolation: so incomprehensible were his aberrations.

On the whole, the general tendency was to apply and develope, on his own principle, the *data* of "religious equality" fixed in 1845 and 1847. He had also learned

by this time to identify his new theories, not only with the cause of civil and religious liberty, but with the dictates of right and justice, and therefore with the precepts and injunctions of Christianity. What was termed the popular principle, indeed, of Government, had wholly extirpated the paternal theory, and the fundamental basis of Mr. Gladstone's popular principle was, that,

“As the public funds are drawn from the labour of the whole community, it is desirable that no class should be excluded from the claim to share in their distribution.”

Of itself that principle strikes at the root of such a union as exists between Church and State in England. And, as Mr. Gladstone himself declared in 1847 that many new, and, to the Church, alien ingredients were being infused into the composition of the Legislature; and that the desire for organic change in the connexion between the Church and the State depended, among all the more seriously attached members of the Church, simply upon the delicacy and caution and kindly, considerate feeling of the Legislature towards the Church; seeing also that Mr. Gladstone has ever since devoted himself to dissolving the bonds of union between Church and State, without any regard either to delicacy, or caution, or kindliness, or consideration for the Church, does it not seem to follow that he has not only long ago conceived the desire for those organic changes, but that he has also decided to gratify that desire to the full?

SECTION II.

FROM 1859 TO THE PRESENT TIME.

RELIGIOUS EQUALITY—DISENDOWMENT OF ALL RELIGIONS.

I HAVE before stated that, notwithstanding his strictures upon the Reform Bill of 1859, Mr. Gladstone voted against Lord John Russell's resolution, by which that measure was prematurely stifled. After the General Election Mr. Gladstone also voted against the amendment on the address moved by the Marquis of Hartington. That amendment, however, having been carried by a majority of 13, Lord Derby's second ministry was immediately dissolved. Lord Palmerston then succeeded in forming his second administration, which, according to previous arrangement, was constructed upon a broader basis than the former one, so as to include not only Lord John Russell but Mr. Milner Gibson and others of the Radical faction.

Knowing that such was to be the case, Mr. Gladstone nevertheless at once accepted office under Lord Palmerston—the very individual to whom, of living statesmen, Mr. Gladstone, up to 1859, had been the most bitterly and most constantly opposed. His reasons for that step were explained, or rather stated, at the time, in a published letter to the Provost of Oriel College. Those reasons apparently amount to nothing more than this, that Mr. Gladstone was thoroughly wearied of the Ishmaelitic warfare he had carried on, with occasional periods of cessation, for the previous 12 years, and that, as Lord Palmerston offered the safest harbour of refuge, he had finally decided to take up his berth there.

It was, of course, implied that in ranging himself alongside such heretical craft as Lord Palmerston had collected, Mr. Gladstone had all the nobler mission to fulfil. It was, to be sure, a piece of wondrous condescension on his part; but then, every conscientious sacrifice would be in due time appreciated and rewarded. And Mr. Gladstone's special call, according to his friends, was to leaven that puritanical and latitudinarian lump with the unction of Dogma and Anglicanism. It was this representation of Mr. Gladstone's position in the Cabinet which enabled him to defeat Lord Chandos at Oxford in 1859.

Great dissatisfaction had been created among certain churchmen by previous Episcopal appointments under Lord Palmerston's former Government. Now, I am betraying no secret, I believe, in stating that, on his

acceptance of office in 1859, under Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone wrote a certain letter, which fell, of course by accident, into the hands of a certain member of the Episcopal bench. That letter distinctly intimated that the writer of it was to have some considerable influence in the disposition of Church patronage in the gift of the Government.

The contents of that letter were immediately made public. All at once Mr. Gladstone's chances of re-election went up in a marvellous degree. Some persons, indeed, who had promised to oppose him, begged to be released from their promises, on the strength of that letter. Meanwhile, at a certain annual and opportune meeting at a certain Episcopal palace, the letter had been openly canvassed if not actually read, and the result was, that the vast majority of incumbents in that diocese polled for Mr. Gladstone. Accordingly he was again returned for Oxford University.

Whether Mr. Gladstone's pretensions at the time were either justifiable or creditable, when regarded merely in the light of an election manœuvre, may well be a matter of dispute. That numbers were duped by the plausible pretence, and that they have cursed their credulity in 1859, many a time since, is unquestionable; for subsequent events all combine to prove that Mr. Gladstone's influence was grossly overrated, if not by himself, by others on his representation. They also go to show that no reliance is to be placed either on his views or engagements, simply because, sooner or later, he may deem it

his bounden duty, in the cause of what, since 1842, he terms civil and religious freedom, to recant the former and repudiate the latter.

At first, however, it must be allowed that Mr. Gladstone strove in some respect to act up to the expectations he had raised on the eve of his re-election. He continued to oppose Sir J. Trelawny's motion for the unconditional abolition of Church Rates, and he also resisted Mr. Dillwyn's Endowed Schools Bill in 1859, notwithstanding the following appeal by that hon. gentleman :—

"The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir G. C. Lewis) had said that this Bill was little else than the assertion of a naked principle. That principle had been illustrated by the hon. seconder of the amendment (Mr. Puller), who said that, as long as the Church of England maintained its present national status, a Dissenter was not, in fact, upon a par of religious equality with a Churchman. He wished, so far as it was practicable, to diminish that inequality, and he was particularly desirous of testing the opinions of the Government in regard to that principle, in order that he might determine whether or not he could give them his hearty support."

As usual, however, Mr. Gladstone supported, both by speech and vote, another Roman Catholic Relief Bill, which, among other things, was designed to admit Romanists to the Irish Chancellorship.

In 1860 he also opposed Mr. Locke King's Religious Worship Bill; but, in noticing some remarks by Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Gladstone made the following extraordinary statement :—

“More than thirty years have elapsed since we avowedly recognised the admission into Parliament of persons not professing the established religion of the country ; and I would appeal to any one connected with the established religion, including those who are in an especial manner responsible for the defence of its interests, to say whether any injury at all to those interests has arisen from the right which has been conceded. On the contrary, as one of those who represent a large portion of the clergy of this country, I must answer that appeal in the negative, and bear my testimony to the fact that nothing can be more remarkable, as a general rule, than the considerate liberality and the high feeling with which hon. gentlemen, not professing the established religion of the country, have refrained from using any privilege or power they had obtained, as members of this House, to the prejudice of that religion.”

Significant as is that gratuitous declaration, we shall presently find that it was but the key-note to one long-sustained strain, which Mr. Gladstone seems fond of rehearsing. But the chief event of 1860 was the Government Reform Bill, the main provision of which, the £6 franchise, was stoutly vindicated :—

“Is it then a reasonable or an unreasonable admission that is proposed by this Bill? You will tell me that in speaking of amount, I am speaking of quantity only, not of quality. I take leave to demur to that imputation. I say, if we are justified in stating that we deal only with the more instructed, intelligent, and independent portion of the working classes of England, that we are speaking of and dealing with quality as well as with quantity. You want no selection from them. And I confess, if you are to lay down the doctrine of selection, and to be so very eclectic in the formation of your Parliamentary system, I really do not know where your principle would stop in its movement upwards. I am by no means disposed to admit that

the shopkeeper between £10 and £20 is always a very wise man, or always a very contented, very intelligent, and very independent man.

“My hon. friend (Mr. Gregory) says that four out of five gentlemen are full of alarm and horror at this measure, and the ground of that alarm and horror is that a £6 franchise, as we are told, will swamp the constituency by the addition of an overwhelming mass of votes of the lower class, immense in quantity, bad in quality, and able to outweigh and overdo the other classes of the constituency. Sir, I do not admit that the working man, regarded as an individual, is less worthy of the suffrage than any other class. I do not admit the charges of corruption which my right hon. friend read from the report of a committee of the House of Lords. I do not believe that the working men of this country are possessed of a disposition to tax their neighbours and exempt themselves; nor do I acknowledge for a moment that schemes of socialism, of communism, of republicanism, or any other ideas at variance with the law and the constitution of the realm, are prevalent and popular among them. I grant you that you might corrupt the working class of this country if you gave it a monopoly of power; but it is not now corrupt, and the question is—would this Bill give it that monopoly of power?”

“Differing from gentlemen, if there be those who would hold out America as a pattern, I frankly own that it will be a miserable day for England when she thinks fit to adopt America as her example, and that it is England who has much to teach to America and little to learn from her. These are not only my opinions, but they are the opinions of at least 99 men out of every 100 throughout the country.

“The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) recommended that the noble lord should withdraw the Bill. The right hon. baronet (Sir E. Lytton) whose good faith in giving us the advice no one can doubt, also recommended us to withdraw the Bill. The course which those right hon. gentlemen ask us to take, however, is one which it is impossible for the Government to adopt.

I may, at all events, venture to say for myself, that, in my opinion, *any ministry which should have introduced a measure such as this, with so little caution, and in a shape so unfitted to undergo discussion as to render it expedient that it should be withdrawn without the decision of the House being taken upon it, would, in so acting, have covered itself with irretrievable disgrace.* I may add, that no such idea, or intention, or dream, as the adoption of such a course presupposes, has ever entered our heads."

Shortly after, however, that "irretrievable disgrace" overtook both Mr. Gladstone and all his colleagues, and appears to have been borne with most exemplary patience.

From the above quotations it will also be seen that Mr. Gladstone took it for granted that the £6 franchise would be specially favourable to the working classes; but this fact has never yet been proved, and every probability makes for a different conclusion. A £6 franchise, indeed, would merely reduce the larger provincial towns to the present level of metropolitan constituencies by giving a monopoly of power, not to the working classes, but to the small shopkeeping classes, who are chiefly either Dissenters or Romanists, and almost invariably democratic.

Though not, perhaps, wholly in keeping with our subject, I may here take note of Mr. Gladstone's proceedings in connexion with the Budget of 1860. A course of action by the Peers, justified even by Lord Palmerston and the moderate Liberal party, and by the

House of Commons itself, with the exception of about 50 of its members, was designated by Mr. Gladstone as—

“a gigantic innovation, the most gigantic and the most dangerous that has been attempted in our times.”

He also added—

“I do not scruple to say that, in my opinion, this House would do well to vindicate and establish its rights by action; and, without in the least degree imputing blame to, or finding fault with, the terms of the proposal of the Government, I reserve to myself entire freedom to adopt any mode which may have the slightest hope of success for vindicating by action the rights of this House.”

Possibly the following criticism of the veteran Lyndhurst may be interesting.

“I will only further observe, that the illusions, perhaps I may say the delusions, created by the introduction of the Budget seem to have passed away, and we have learnt that, although brilliant eloquence has charms, yet, like other seductions, it is not without its dangers. The same schemes may bear the impress of genius, of imprudence, of rashness. *Satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum* is not an irreconcilable combination.”

With respect to the Latin quotation, I may be allowed, perhaps, to say that there is another reading of *loquentiæ*, instead of *eloquentiæ*, and that, in this case at least, it seems the better of the two.

As some foil to Mr. Gladstone's menace in 1860, contrast his references to the House of Lords in 1835 and 1854.

It only remains to add that, in the discussion on the

Census Bill in 1860, Mr. Gladstone kept perfect silence, though the words "religious profession" were struck out by the Government at the dictation of those hon. gentleman not professing the established religion of the country, whose considerate liberality and high feeling in refraining from using any privilege or power they had obtained as members of Parliament, to the prejudice of that religion, have been already celebrated.

In 1861 Mr. Gladstone thus spoke on Sir J. Trelawny's motion, alluding again, and in a somewhat different tone, to the House of Lords :—

"My opinions on this subject are unchanged; but I am bound to avow publicly that, if they had been changed, I could not act in any other sense, consistently with personal honour as the representative of the University of Oxford. With the conviction—I may say, the knowledge—which I have of the hard and even cruel bearing which, in practice, the present Bill would have upon the interests of the Church, I should feel it due to those whom I have the honour to represent, supposing my opinions to have undergone a change, to give them an opportunity of having their interests and claims stated in this House by some one whose opinions were more congenial to their own. In that case, considering the office I now hold, I should find myself in no small difficulty. It has been recently ruled by the courts of law that a clergyman may not marry himself; and I am not sure whether it is open to a Chancellor of the Exchequer to confer upon himself the office of Steward of the Chiltern Hundreds. I am of opinion that it is a matter fairly open to argument whether the practical effect of abolishing Church Rates would be to endanger the union of Church and State or not. In the case of Ireland, where Church Rates were abolished in 1833, the practical effect has been materially to strengthen the position of the Church in that country.

"I want to know who pays the Church Rate in the rural parishes. The land pays it. It is a burden upon the land, not as to the real disbursement of the sum, but as to its real and substantial incidence.

"If the land bears the rate, if the occupier of the land manages it, who enjoys the benefit of it? Why, the peasantry of the country.

"This I must say, that if the Church Rate law is an old law, if it still retains the vigour and pliability of youth, if it is an old law, if it is a good law, if it is congenial to the spirit of our institutions, if it provides gratuitously the means of Divine ordinances for the poor, and if these amount in the aggregate to a large portion of the people, I must hold it too much to say that we are to abolish such a law as that, in order to meet the scruples, or, not the scruples, but the convenience, of individuals who dislike to pay the *tax*, but will not accept an exemption.

"A gentleman distinguished in the service of this House (Mr. Erskine May) in an admirable work, added to other admirable contributions to our literature, has pointed out that in substance, and for certain purposes, you cannot deny that the House of Lords possesses many of the elements of a representative character. It is representative, at any rate, of one class, I mean especially of that class which is interested in the land; and when the House of Lords shall or may think fit from year to year again and again to reject Bills going up from this House on the motion of the hon. baronet (Sir J. Trelawny), for the purpose of exempting the land from charge, I think the House of Lords, in refusing to confer on themselves such an enormous pecuniary boon as is proposed to be forced upon them by the excessive and officious attachment of the hon. baronet and his colleagues, the country will feel that, in taking that course, the House of Lords is not interfering with the privileges of Parliament, but is occupying a strong and probably an impregnable position.

"I do earnestly hope that we may bethink ourselves on the prolongation of this almost hopeless warfare. No one will more rejoice than I shall, if the end of this reflection should be

the attainment of a satisfactory settlement of the question ; but I am bound to say, as a member for a clerical constituency, and I must add, on broader and larger grounds, it is my absolute duty to record my vote in opposition to the second reading of this Bill."

As to the joke about the Chiltern Hundreds, it was introduced in 1854 in the speech on the Oxford University Bill. But, with respect to the connexion between Church Rates and the Union of Church and State, it may be as well to refer back to the speeches of 1858 and 1837 on this subject.

Another question of 1861, in which Mr. Gladstone took some interest, was the University Elections Bill. On its third reading the adjournment of the House was thrice moved by Government agency, Mr. Gladstone stating that it introduced great novelties into the law, and Mr. Dodson (one of its authors) maintaining that

"Those who had introduced the measure had great reason to complain of the course taken by the Government in opposing the further progress of the Bill, after it had been so long before the House and so often discussed, without giving any notice of their intentions."

Subsequently Mr. Gladstone described the main provision of the Bill as

"A proposition certainly of a most extraordinary character, and as strange and startling an innovation on our electoral law as has ever come before us."

Not satisfied with opposing a Bill specially devised to

meet the convenience and interests of his constituents, Mr. Gladstone proceeded to compliment the members of the Universities in the following language :—

“However unlikely, I may say impossible, the case of fraud may be in a University election, yet we must include it. If we sanction these principles in University elections, in consequence of what we may think of the high character and intelligence of the constituency, it will not be easy to deny to others what we give to Universities, even though we may think them of low character and intelligence.

“Let the House remember that there is already one vicious element in a University constituency, with which all those who have been connected with University elections cannot fail to be practically acquainted. It may not hitherto have told so much in Parliamentary as in other elections, but under this Bill I think it would be found more conspicuous in Parliamentary elections. I refer to the disposition towards college combinations, and the working out, through those combinations, of selfish wishes and limited views, instead of adopting the broader views connected with the whole University. College organization is in fatal conformity with the other injurious provisions of the Bill as it now stands, because, of course, the authorities of a college would be able to say that they were personally acquainted with all who had passed through the college, although their acquaintance may have diminished to the lowest degree; and a number of proxies may be accumulated in the hands of these authorities, which may be intrigued with or used as a means of obtaining an illegitimate influence over a candidate, to obtain pledges from him, and to destroy the pure and honest freedom of all parties at such elections. These are consequences for which I am determined to be in no degree responsible.”

To show that Mr. Gladstone is not deemed wholly impeccable I append Mr. Dodson’s rejoinder :—

“The right hon. gentleman spoke in high-sounding words and grandiloquent phrases of the strange and startling innovation introduced by this Bill. But the provision he specially objected to was discussed in Committee for three hours last week ; and the most strange and startling thing connected with that discussion was the absence of the right hon. gentleman. Not only was there a discussion of three hours, but there was a discussion in which the right hon. gentleman took no part ; but within half an hour afterwards there was another division, and upon that the Chancellor of the Exchequer voted. It would be an interesting fact to learn how far off was the right hon. gentleman when the first division took place.”

When we remember, however, the history of Mr. Gladstone's connexion with the representation of Oxford University, and especially when we call to mind the artifice employed in 1859, we know of other means, besides college combinations, “to destroy the pure and honest freedom of all parties at such elections.”

The only other measure of 1861 to be noticed was Sir M. Peto's Burial Bill, which Mr. Gladstone by his vote opposed.

In 1862 Mr. Gladstone seems to have been in a state of suspense. Those whom he had complimented in 1860 upon their forbearance and honourable dealings towards the Established Church, though not professing its tenets, had from that time multiplied their offensive operations against the Church. Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Dellwyn, Mr. Baines, and Sir M. Peto renewed their attacks year by year. Other members not Dissenters—Sir J. Trelawny, Mr. Bouverie, and Mr. Locke King—were

likewise prosecuting hostile proceedings, and were well seconded by the dissenting and democratic sections. These parties, again, were regularly supported by several subordinate members of the Government, and at least by one Cabinet Minister. Under these circumstances Mr. Gladstone seems to have abstained in 1862 from all action upon Church questions. The only exception to this statement has to be made in regard to another Clergy Relief Bill, similar to the one of 1849, and which, as well as the former, he supported.

But in 1863 that state of comparative inactivity was superseded by a policy which may well give name to the last development in his career.

The first measure on which that change in Mr. Gladstone's policy was manifested, was Mr. Hadfield's Qualification for Offices Bill. This measure, be it observed, was proposed now for the *fifth* time; and yet Mr. Gladstone had never supported it before. In 1863 he not only voted, but spoke at length in its favour—

“ And here I place myself in the position of one who, in addition to his general duties as a minister of the Crown and member of Parliament, has a special duty as the representative of a large portion of the clergy of the Church of England; and I confidently say, holding the language I have held ever since I had the honour to represent them—now a period of fifteen years—that no benefit accrues to the Church of England from the maintenance of such a declaration. I do not deny that in 1828 it was wise of Lord J. Russell, or of those who supported him, to accept the declaration; but the circumstances of 1828 were different from those of 1863. Look at the manner in which,

since 1828, the whole system of the administration of the State has been altered—how it has been founded upon the general recognition of the equal civil rights of the members of all religions. I admit this declaration does contain in it, more or less, an acknowledgment of civil inequality. But let me look at this declaration as a security. If it be a security, it is one which each person may interpret for himself. Now, it is not good policy to depend upon declarations the whole force of which depends upon private interpretation, and is not sufficient to bind many persons, though it is sufficient to bind the more scrupulous and conscientious man. But, sir, I do not admit that the Church of England has any occasion to take a security of this kind. It is admitted that the pressure of this declaration is intended to be upon Dissenters; *but I do not see any danger to the Church of England arising from Dissenters or Roman Catholics. If the Church of England has dangers—and I fear she has—they arise from internal dissensions. But for the last thirty years I have not been able to trace any danger to the Church of England arising from the political acts of the Dissenters.* At any rate, having myself for so many years represented a large body of the clergy of the Church of England, and having on various occasions submitted my claims to represent them to their revision, I have no hesitation in saying that, although on certain other occasions I may be called upon to differ from my hon. friend who is the proposer of this Bill (Mr. Hadfield), and the hon. gentleman who has seconded the third reading (Mr. Baines), they are, by the course which they have taken, in point of fact acting the part of true and prudent friends of the real interests of the Church of England."

In this extract Mr. Gladstone himself refers to the year 1847, when he first sat for Oxford University, as to a period from which, at least, he had constantly held a certain form of language. The only pity is that he did not plainly inform his constituents in 1847, or rather

beforehand, that he intended to hold that language. It is also somewhat singular, to say the least, that it was not till 1863 he held that language on Mr. Hadfield's Bill, although the measure had been not only proposed during four sessions prior to 1863, but actually carried four times through the House of Commons.

The marked allusion to his connexion with the University and clergy was another exquisite piece of delicacy and refined taste, I suppose. Of course, Mr. Gladstone gave his supporters timely notice in 1859, in that famous letter which carried his election, that he intended to vote for such measures as Mr. Hadfield's. Did he? Another question also may be asked. Before Mr. Gladstone could be justified in appealing to his position as representative of the University of Oxford, in proof that a large body of the clergy of the Church of England approved of Mr. Hadfield's Bill, ought he not to have again submitted his claims to represent them to their revision, on that question? Had he done so, it may well be doubted whether he would ever again have been in a position to make such an appeal.

As to the political acts of Dissenters and the Church of England, did Mr. Gladstone intend by the latter phrase to mean the Established Church? This question is by no means irrelevant, for Mr. Gladstone appears well versed in that Tractarian casuistry which was denominated the Economy. Neither is this the only occasion on which some evasion or equivocation appears to be at least possible.

However, if by Church of England Mr. Gladstone meant the Established Church, as his audience would probably infer that he did, then I may remind him that in 1837 he stated that—

“It was plain, from the recorded admissions of Dissenters in that House, that all future attempts to act on the principle of an Establishment would be resisted to the utmost by that which styled itself the popular party.”

In 1841, in his Preface to “The State in its Relations with the Church,” he also spoke of the age as one “which inclines to secularise the State.”

With respect, again, to Mr. Hadfield’s measure itself, to kindred questions, the following extracts from that work itself may be interesting :—

“It would seem, at first sight, that little space remains between the present position—the recognised admission of all Christian denominations into the Legislature, and therefore, that men vitally at variance on matters of religion are held equally competent to be good citizens and officers of State—and the dissolution of the union between the Church and the State; but it is not quite so. We may have surrendered some of the defences and out-works of national religion, but we have maintained the principle, because all those who exercise office among us are, either by their membership, Churchmen, or, in the view of the law, assumed to be, at worst, indifferent, or, in the case of being Roman Catholics, and therefore, having presumably a rival interest, by the specific obligations which they undertake, obliged to refrain from using any of their powers thus acquired to the detriment of the Church Establishment. But the citadel, not yet surrendered, is unequivocally beleaguered.”

Again :—

“This divorce of religion from government will proceed upon the principle that men of all religions, or none, are alike to be considered competent for the duties of citizenship.”

Up to 1842, again, Mr. Gladstone held that the admission of Jews to municipal and parliamentary privileges would powerfully assist towards a fatal decision against the union of Church and State, and that

“The declaration which all holders of office are obliged to take is one of the signs by which is attested, or wherein consists, the nationality of the Church of England.”

In 1858, even, he admitted that the question of Church Rates

“Is used to cover and screen ulterior objects for which the claimants of abolition thought the time was not yet arrived, more explicitly to avoid.”

It seems, then, that though in 1860, and again in 1863, Mr. Gladstone averred that, for the last 30 years and more, he could not trace any danger to the Church of England arising from the political acts of Dissenters, his witness agrees not with itself. In truth, the whole tenour of his first work goes upon the supposition that the union of Church and State was in imminent peril, from the opening sentence, which ran thus:—

“Probably there never was a time in the history of our country when the connexion between the Church and the State was threatened from quarters so manifold and various as at present.”

And so late as 1847 Mr. Gladstone himself pointed

to the new and alien elements being infused into Parliament, as a source of danger to the union of Church and State, and as capable, under certain very probable contingencies, of inspiring even Churchmen with the desire for organic change.

Is it to be supposed, then, that among those new and alien elements, those quarters so manifold and various, whence the connexion between the Church and the State was threatened, all the dissenting denominations were excluded? The very contrary is nearer both to probability and to truth.

It is, then, but a recent discovery of Mr. Gladstone's, this considerate liberality and high feeling of Dissenters towards the Established Church. But what shall be said of that discovery when brought to the test of history and fact during the last 30 years?

So long ago as from 1847 there has been a regular organized Anti-State Church party, even in Parliament. What, again, is the Liberation Society, founded in 1844, with its income of £5000 per annum, and its agents, lecturers, and delegates in every town in the kingdom? Is it or is it not a fact that, with the exception of the Conference Wesleyans, the whole of the dissenting body are all but uniformly political agitators?

For more particular information on this head I may refer to the chapter on "What Dissent has done, is doing, and intends to do," in a former book. Here I shall only add, that I believe Dissenters themselves would be the first to repudiate Mr. Gladstone's disparaging

estimate of their vigorous crusade against the Church Establishment for the last 30 years or so.

The next measure that demands attention is Sir M. Peto's Burial Bill, which was introduced for the second time. The main principle of this Bill was to throw open the churchyard, not only for dissenting burial but for dissenting services. Mr. Gladstone, however, contrived to ignore the latter and main point, and to direct his remarks to Clause 1, which simply claimed permission for burial without any service. On this ground alone he supported the whole Bill on its second reading.

"Dissenters have access to our churchyards, subject to two conditions, namely, subject, first of all, perhaps, to the condition of being baptized; and, secondly, without doubt, subject to the condition of having the service of the Church of England read over their remains by the appointed minister of the Church of England, whatever their objection, either to that service or to the communion of the Church, as a whole, may be. With regard to the matter of baptisms, I do not understand it to be clear law whether the unbaptized have a right to sepulture in the parish churchyard or not. If they have not the right, I cannot deny that it seems to me to be a question worthy of the consideration of the House, whether or not the law should be altered in that respect. I speak now simply of sepulture, and not of religious rights, nor do I presume to give a very confident opinion on that point.

"But the other point, which is subject to no doubt at all, is one on which I venture to express a very confident and very strong opinion—that it gives the Dissenter some title to come before this House and ask for an alteration of the law. If he has access to the churchyard, or has access to it subject exclusively and absolutely to the condition of having the service

of the Church read over his remains, I confess that I do not think that that is a state of the law which is consistent with those principles of civil and religious freedom on which, for a series of years, our legislation has been based."

As Mr. Gathorne Hardy remarked, that mode of putting the question by Mr. Gladstone was more subtle than fair. Yet we are required to believe that Mr. Gladstone's wish was simply to pass Clause 1, though that was neither the main provision of the Bill nor what Dissenters avowed to be the great object of the measure.

On Mr. Dodson presenting (July 24th) the petition from the University of Oxford for the abolition of the requirement of subscription to formularies of faith as a qualification for academical degrees, Mr. Gladstone said—

"If the petition is intended to imply that those who are to receive academical degrees, without subscription to the formularies of faith as a qualification, are to go forward and exercise all governing functions in the University, that, I admit, raises a practical question of the utmost difficulty; nor do I know in what manner it would be possible to govern Universities, constituted like those of Oxford and Cambridge, upon the principle of a general mixture of belief in the governing body. I do not now say whether in particular professorships, with particular qualifications, it might not be possible for the University to devise some exceptional system for individual admission. I speak of the general character of the governing body, and I must confess that it appears to me a fair and just demand on the part of the Church of England, that the governing body in her Universities and her Colleges should be composed of her members.

“The system of the Universities is one which involves full and plenary responsibility, not merely for the instruction, in the narrow sense of the word, but for the moral training and the entire formation of the character of the youth committed to their charge. I will not stand upon any abstract principle of an abstruse character, but I will say these two things: In the first place, I think that the parents of England will not be satisfied to send their children for academical training to an institution calling itself a University, and professing to take charge of their whole life, and the formation of their whole moral character, unless they be convinced that it is administered in conformity with some definite religious system. But if it be true, as I believe it is true in the main, that the religious system of the Church of England, as administered in the English Universities, is suitable to the wants, feelings, and convictions of perhaps 19-20ths of the community who are in a condition to avail themselves of University education—I say we must consider the case of those 19-20ths first, and in preference to that of any minority which is numerically small.

“I have spoken thus far of what I think seems to be the justice and fairness of keeping the governing body of the Universities in the hands of members of the Church of England. But if I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Dodson) rightly, he stated that the object of those who signed the petition is to establish in Oxford the system which is established in Cambridge and Dublin. With regard to the establishment of that system in Oxford, I must say, in passing, that I should be very sorry to see the intervention of Parliament used at the present time, except under an urgent necessity, for the purpose of effecting a compulsory change in the regulations of the University. I frankly own that I am of opinion an improvement in those regulations might be made, but I think it most desirable, upon every ground, that that improvement should rather owe its origin to the spontaneous and enlightened convictions of the University itself, than to an invocation of the arm of the State. I am disposed to regret, therefore, that those petitioners should

not have made their appeal to the University before coming to Parliament."

The real significance of those remarks will be more evident when the events of 1864 are reviewed.

Mr. Buxton having brought forward a motion for the relaxation of the terms of clerical subscription, the following remarks were uttered by Mr. Gladstone:—

"The idea of clergymen, authorized and paid by the State, being allowed to pass through the country, or to settle themselves individually in respective districts, and there to teach to the laity whatever happens to approve itself to the mind of each individual clergyman—such a course of proceeding would be not only a breach of all the laws of the Church, but a violation of all the traditions, a desecration of all the feelings, and a contempt of all the rights of the people."

What have the clergy to say to that stigma? Did Mr. Gladstone ever tell them, on the eve of a University election, that they were "authorized and paid by the State?"

Another question of 1863, supported by Mr. Gladstone, was the Prison Ministers' Bill, a measure similar to that proposed by Mr. Langdale in 1838, to which Mr. Gladstone then objected, as an

"Infringement of the principle on which the Established Church was founded—that of confining the pecuniary support of the State to one particular religious denomination."

The events of 1864 are too fresh in the recollection of all to demand minute reference. One of the earliest,

however, is, perhaps, the most striking. So early as March, Mr. Dodson proposed the second reading of a Bill embodying the petition presented towards the close of July 1863. The main objects, indeed, of the Oxford University Tests Bill were to admit Dissenters not only to the Government, but to the permanent emoluments of the University. Condemning these proposals by his speech, Mr. Gladstone, nevertheless, voted for the second reading of the measure, his object being, forsooth, simply to adopt at Oxford the system established at Cambridge, in regard to all degrees above that of B.A.

On this Bill, therefore, he followed out the course taken in the Burials' Bill in 1863. Whilst aiming at redressing an infinitesimal grievance, by his vote, at least, he committed himself to an innovation involving a principle of the most vital import. Moreover, whilst, at the close of the session of 1863,

“He thought it most desirable that that improvement should rather owe its origin to the spontaneous and enlightened convictions of the University itself, than to an invocation of the arm of the State,”

at the beginning of the Session of 1864, forgetful of the salutary maxims expressed in 1855 and repeated in 1863, Mr. Gladstone was prepared to invoke the arm of the State rather than trust to the spontaneous and enlightened convictions of the University. In justice I must add, that, on the third reading of Mr. Dodson's

Bill, Mr. Gladstone voted in the majority, against it. On the second reading, however, Mr. Gladstone contrived to put in a protest against what he termed "indiscriminate resistance," which considerably modified his disapproval of the main objects of the Bill.

"Lately it has been too much the fashion to adopt a policy of indiscriminate resistance. I am not here to seek for favour by holding language which would allow it for one moment to be believed that I think the maintenance of the definite religion of the Church of England is a matter of small or secondary importance. On the contrary, I believe that there is no higher object which any member of that Church could set before himself than that. With that policy of indiscriminating resistance to almost every measure aiming at relaxation or relief I decline to associate myself."

Here, again, let it be observed how careful Mr. Gladstone is to speak of the Church of England, and not of the Established Church of England.

Mr. Gladstone's political connexions generally, as well as his personal character, derived much additional lustre from the session of 1864. First of all it was his duty or pleasure, or both, to defend his colleague Mr. Stansfeld in the matter of the Greco Conspiracy. That debate again introduced Massini, "The Theory of the Dagger" and assassination, generally, upon the stage; and Sir H. Stracey was moved to ask of Mr. Stansfeld the pertinent question—

"Does he forget that in a certain conspiracy, called the 'Orsini Conspiracy,' in 1858, his name was also mixed up?"

Here, then, I think might be found useful matter for meditation to the political moralist. Throw into the caldron the name of a representative of the University of Oxford, "then the charm is firm and good."

Another great event of 1864 was Mr. Gladstone's speech on Mr. Baines' £6 Borough Franchise Bill. It would be the merest prudery, or worse, on the part of any one, however devoted to Gladstonism, to affect any doubt of the tendency of that manifesto. The only question seems to be whether it pointed to the goal of manhood or universal suffrage.

"I venture to say," declared a representative of Oxford University, "*that every man who is not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger, is morally entitled to come within the pale of the Constitution.*"

That different interpretations have been put upon that statement I am aware ; but still, that difference is one of degree rather than of kind. Said the *Times*,

"Surely this is the language of sweeping and levelling Democracy, of men who have emancipated themselves from the doctrine of the right Divine of kings, in order to fall into the equally dangerous fallacy of the right Divine of multitudes. It is equality against liberty, theory against practice, abstract dogmatism against experience, a confusion between the end and the means."

"He has unfurled the old, long-lost flag of the Liberal party," said the *Daily News*.

Mr. Bright's organ was in ecstasies :—

"Chartism itself did not assert more than the title to the

franchise of 'every man not incapacitated by personal unfitness or political danger,' " exclaimed the *Star*.

Referring to the words of the speech quoted above, the *Nonconformist* proceeded—

"This is the standard which the Chancellor of the Exchequer accepts as decisive. Of course *we* are specially gratified at his having thus reverted to it; for we laboured more than 20 years ago to get it recognised."

What, then, was that standard of the *Nonconformist*? It was Complete Suffrage; that is, Manhood Suffrage. But the *Nonconformist* not only approved of Universal Suffrage, but counselled an amalgamation of the Complete Suffrage and Chartist movements, as being essentially identical. All this has been pointed out at length in a former treatise, "Dissent and Democracy."

With that of the *Nonconformist* agrees also the testimony of the *Saturday Review*, which concluded that Mr. Gladstone had adopted "the Manhood Suffrage platform."

Was, then, the object for which Mr. Gladstone was returned, by the most Conservative constituency in the kingdom, to utter the language of sweeping and levelling Democracy, to adopt Chartism, or that Complete Suffrage of the *Nonconformist*, which was advocated chiefly, as being the best means and shortest course to the separation of Church and State?

But the session of 1864 was also unusually prolific of personal contention. First, there was Mr. Gladstone's

wanton attack upon Mr. Sheridan, in which, however, eventually, he was thrown with a heavy fall. And seldom was victor saluted with more ringing cheers than was Mr. Sheridan, especially from the back ministerial benches. If any one wishes to know the reason for those cheers, I commend to his perusal Mr. Sheridan's speech of March 17th, especially if he has been carefully brought up in a pious belief of Mr. Gladstone's superfine sanctity and transcendent purity of motives.

With respect to Mr. Gladstone's share in the deportation of the Italian hero, it may not be so easy to define it. This much, however, I venture to assert, and not without authority: that Garibaldi was both brought to England and removed from England by Government agency; that his visit was to be converted into political capital for the Government; that, when the hero arrived, however, the Democratic and Anti-State Church party interposed, and sought to turn him to its purposes; and that, ultimately, another foreign power intervened, which cut short both ministerial and democratic intrigue.

As to Garibaldi's health being the actual and original cause of his premature removal—*credat Judæus*. That this was the cause studiously bruited about, and *omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse*, I allow; but then the statement was disseminated by Government organs. Certain it is that to no one was Garibaldi's impaired health so great a mystery as to himself. His incre-

dulity on that head was simply invincible to the last, notwithstanding the officious demonstrations of medical and "diplomatic friends." However, neither declining health, nor temporary illness, nor incipient disease generated by fatigue, was the real substantive primary cause of his departure. What that cause was I have already hinted at, and it was known at the time by all whose sense or better information was proof against the sorceries of certain Government-inspired journals. The stories, therefore, of Garibaldi's maladies were not only pure fiction, but a villainous, though dexterous hoax, in so far, at least, as they were represented to be the principal cause of his being hurried away from our shores with such desperate haste.

Now, whether as a Cabinet Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone was likely to be acquainted with the actual facts of Garibaldi's case or no, I leave to others to determine. This much is beyond doubt, that, both to the hero himself and to the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone's version was not "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," whatever his own convictions might be.

There is yet another matter of 1864 to which I may advert as bearing upon Mr. Gladstone's personal demeanour. In the great debate on our meddling and muddling policy towards Denmark he ventured to charge the leader of the Opposition with "quoting a letter in a manner entirely to *falsify* its purport and effect."

Subsequently, however, he was constrained to volunteer the apology—

“I think the expression was a very improper one, and I sincerely regret that I have used it.”

Comment would be superfluous.

With respect to the present session, Mr. Gladstone voted, as in 1854, against the motion for Government inspection of conventual institutions.

The House of Commons again testified its sympathy for Mr. Sheridan's annual motion on fire-insurance, or, possibly, for the author of the motion himself, by defeating Mr. Gladstone's amendment of “the previous question,” by more than two votes to one.

Mr. Gladstone's proclivity to personal imputations has again developed itself. This time it is Mr. Baillie Cochrane who has had the honour of ruffling the right hon. gentleman's philosophic equanimity. The discussion I shall not enter upon, but it immediately preceded that memorable manifesto of Mr. Gladstone on the Irish Church, delivered on the 29th of March.

This latter is for 1865 what the declaration on the Borough Franchise Bill was for 1864; the starting-post in a new career of democratic innovation, both in our civil and ecclesiastical Institutions. It is the event to which I alluded in the Introduction, and may be deemed the crowning act of defection from the Established Church.

I may repeat that Mr. Gladstone originally intended to make this or a similar announcement, but was over-persuaded, during his last autumnal tour in Lancashire. To some persons, therefore, it can be no surprise. In truth, this is but the next step in Mr. Gladstone's systematic estrangement and declension of the last 20 years and upwards. It serves, however, to corroborate and substantiate the positions maintained in the previous pages. The following remarks, indeed, are nothing more than an echo of what has been repeatedly urged by Mr. Gladstone ever since the year 1844. In substance, he has been saying, of every single encroachment upon the Church from the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill downwards—

“This is not the question of the present, but may be in the future; and let those who undertake the responsibility of delivering their opinions on the subject look not so much to the satisfaction which they may give, at the moment, to those who may hear them, as to the laying down of principles which are founded on truth and justice, and consequently to which future changes of circumstances can bring no disparagement.”

In other words, Mr. Gladstone ever since 1844 has been saying, The exclusive system I have abandoned as impracticable and inconvenient. There is no general principle after that, except religious equality; this, then, we must apply and develop in the spirit of freedom and justice: but, as we cannot endow all, the principles of freedom and justice require that we produce equality by disendowing those religions which are

endowed ; we must, however, take things as we find them, and look rather to the future than the present, but always, at least, take care to lay down those principles of truth, and freedom, and justice which are immutable and will in the end prevail, when the glorious era of religious equality is inaugurated.

In conclusion I would gladly bespeak the attention of Oxford University to the contrast between Mr. Gathorne Hardy's speech and Mr. Gladstone's. Some additional interest in the latter may also be excited by comparing with it the speeches of 1833 and 1835, as well as pp. 79—83 of "The State in its Relations with the Church," which were partially quoted under the year 1844.

It now only remains to say of this narrative, *Hic labor extremus, longarum hæc meta viarum*.

Our retrospect of events since 1859 shall also be brief. For the first session or two after taking office, in 1859, Mr. Gladstone seems to have maintained the *status quo*. Possibly it was the collision of 1860 with the Peers, and the fact of his being thrown by circumstances, though of his own creation, upon the support and sympathy of the Democratic factions, that precipitated him again to a lower region of political speculations. As, in 1844, Mr. Sheil had associated commercial with constitutional changes in Mr. Gladstone's creed, so it may be that the French Treaty and the paper duties are partly responsible for a like development since 1860. Up to 1863, however, Mr. Gladstone followed out the same

course as from 1842 to 1844: he for the most part abstained from active proceedings on constitutional, or, at all events, on ecclesiastical questions. The extraordinary declaration of 1860 relative to Dissenters was, nevertheless, ominous of the future.

In 1863 we may again conclude, *alea jacta est*. But whether we look to Mr. Gladstone's action on the Qualification for Offices Bill, or on the Burials Bill, or on the University Tests Bill, or on the Irish Church, it will be found that his footsteps invariably tend in the same direction,—not simply either to the entire abrogation of certain Church privileges, or to the distribution of such privileges, on the fancied basis of religious liberty, among Dissenters, but to the abrogation and distribution of privileges which hitherto have formed part of the exclusive patrimony of the Church, and which, therefore, it is necessary, first of all, to alienate from the Church.

His present policy, therefore, is that ulterior development of religious equality which consists in producing equality by the subtraction of all exceptional privileges universally. In other words, an equilibrium is to be produced by reducing all religions to the uniform level of absolute equality before the law, by disendowing and disestablishing all alike. That the course of action taken by Mr. Gladstone upon the Reform question is not only a confirmation of my inference, but is the only effectual means to that end of perfect universal religious equality, will be shown hereafter. I conclude, then, that at

length Mr. Gladstone has avowedly committed himself to the separation of Church and State.

But what is the meaning of that phrase? Briefly, it is to separate the Church from her endowments; but it is something more: it is to rescind for ever the Church's claims to any of those 19 exceptional privileges enumerated by Gladstone on pages 238, 239, and 240. More particularly, to separate Church and State is to abolish all the exclusive rights and privileges of the Church—in the Coronation Oath; in the Acts of Union and Settlement; in the House of Lords; in episcopal and capitular estates; in University emoluments and buildings; in grammar-schools; in certain charitable institutions; in Church Rates; in Easter dues; in tithes; in glebe; in ecclesiastical edifices—cathedrals, churches, and chapels; and in parsonage-houses; and, further, it is to apply those various sources of income and endowment to “secular uses.”

Such is the purport and effect of that religious equality to which a representative of the University of Oxford is now committed. Is that the policy he was expected to develop when he was returned for that constituency?

CHAPTER IV.



CONCLUSION.

I SHALL now proceed, *missis ambagibus*, to reduce to something like order and method the results of previous investigations. I am perfectly conscious of the difficulties of this undertaking.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo? But I still think that the difficulties are subjective rather than objective; that it is far more difficult for a contemporary writer to express what he feels and thinks than to arrive at a correct estimate of Mr. Gladstone's claims and character.

With respect, then, to that which has been the special subject of consideration, Mr. Gladstone's view, at different periods, of the relations that ought to exist between Church and State, it can hardly be doubted, I think, that that view has been according to the various successive phases of an exclusive connexion and religious.

equality. What seems stranger still is the paradox, alternately maintained by Mr. Gladstone, that each system is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of civil liberty.

Now, whatever estimate may be formed of the intrinsic merits of either code of principles, broached successively by Mr. Gladstone, is there nothing questionable or censurable in the mere fact of changing? On this head Mr. Gladstone himself, as is his wont, has laid down an abstract law, that he held himself "free from every slavish regard to a mere phantom of consistency." He regards not "*Palinure's unaltered mood*." He never considers, nor is he bound to consider, whether—

"Ætas animusque virilis
Commisisse cavet quod mox mutare laboret;"

yet that a man, *fluitet dubiæ spe pendulus horæ*, has ever been held a reproach by, I think, as great authorities as Mr. Gladstone.

But what shall be said of a man who has not only gone to the two opposite extremes in change, but who has apparently rushed from the one to avoid the other? I shall not presume to pronounce sentence in such a case; but I have read somewhere that—

"Virtus est medium vitiorum et utrinque reductum."

The same authority has also ruled thus:—

"Dum vitant *stulti* vitia in contraria currunt."

What, however, is to be said of thus changing to extremes when the person changing is bound by engagements, either expressed or implied, not to change, or, at all events, not to adopt any radical changes of opinion or policy? Here, I maintain, lies the peculiar anomaly, or enormity, or what you please, of Mr. Gladstone's conduct for the last 20 years and upwards. In the first place, on the strength of his Tory or Conservative principles he was admitted into the confidence and society of the Tory and Conservative party. On three different occasions he was rewarded with office by that party, in consideration of his avowed sentiments. At the dawn of public life, therefore, he was brought forward into the front ranks of the leading characters of the day, and was ennobled by State honours and official immunities. What return has he made for those distinctions to the party through which they were conferred?

But let us take a glance at Mr. Gladstone's relations with his constituents. By his votes and speeches in 1845 I maintain that he violated the conditions on which he was elected for Newark. The proof is this, that, on his presenting himself in 1846 for re-election, he was repudiated by his former patrons. What, however, is to be said of his connexion with the University of Oxford, in the character of a representative? Is there no disappointment, no infraction of trust, no treachery on the one side, and no repudiation on the other? On the contrary, I venture to say that, on no single con-

tested election since 1847, and including that contest, would Mr. Gladstone have been returned, had he then and there openly and faithfully stated that he intended to follow out the policy subsequently adopted by him.

Take a few questions as illustrative of that view. Immediately after the General Election of 1847 the Jew Bill was introduced. Were Mr. Gladstone's supporters all, or any of them I might possibly say, aware of his intention to support that measure when they voted for him? When, again, his seat was contested in 1852 or 1853, were his supporters informed that he intended to advocate the admission of Dissenters, not only to the University, but to University degrees? Were they not assured of the very contrary? In 1859 did Mr. Gladstone give notice to the University electors that it was his intention to support Mr. Hadfield's Bill, or Sir S. Peto's, or Mr. Dodson's, or Mr. Baines's £6 Franchise Bill, or Mr. Dillwyn's motion on the Irish Church?

Let it not be supposed that I would imply that any representative is to be nothing better than a mere delegate. But—

*“Est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines,
Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum.”*

No member of the House of Commons is returned by any constituency to support, on constitutional questions, the very opposite side to that which those who voted for him wished and expected, and, by the very fact of

supporting, covenanted with the candidate that he should support. But that law holds good more especially of the candidates and representatives for University constituencies, inasmuch as they are accepted on an honourable and express trust, beyond all others.

And herein consists Mr. Gladstone's indefensible breach of faith. Either positively or negatively, or both, he has lent himself to a course of action which has secured his seat for Oxford University. But he has been returned by Conservatives. There was a leading Conservative in 1859 who promised to vote for Lord Chandos. Mr. Gladstone's letter induced him to ask for absolution from that promise. But that was no solitary instance. Numerous, indeed, as are the factions at Oxford, and though all the extremes invariably vote for Mr. Gladstone, they are not in a position to return him. Tractarians, High Calvinists, Liberals, the Anti-State Church party, and the No-Church party, all alike concentrate their energies upon his re-election. But the votes which decide the event in his favour are those of Conservatives. How is this? It is owing partly to personal, but chiefly to political causes. Accustomed to view Mr. Gladstone as he has been or is, they never allow for future aberrations.

Meanwhile his friends and himself combine to keep up the illusion. At this time, even, after all the stupendous changes of the last three years, there are not wanting those who can still represent Mr. Gladstone in the light of a Conservative statesman. Certainly it

is a beggarly and pitiful exhibition they make in having to hinge their case upon one or two isolated and equivocal instances of hypothetical Conservatism, whilst ignoring the gross, palpable, material demonstrations of his utter addiction to the most grovelling forms of Liberalism. However, there are those who are deceived by such representations, and the consequence is, what I have before stated, that Mr. Gladstone sits for Oxford University by virtue of Conservative votes; and that, had he declared himself in his true colours at any contested election since and including that of 1847, he never would have sat for that constituency.

But, say his defenders, can any living person question "his earnest will and intention to do his very best for the Church of God in this realm?" Now, first of all, let us raise a clear issue. What mean they by "the Church of God in this realm?" This sort of language resembles too much the style of speech used by Mr. Gladstone himself for the last 20 years. If they mean simply the Tractarian system, let them say so. If they mean even the Church of England in her spiritualities only, let them say so. Do they mean the Protestant Established Church of this realm of England and Ireland? If so, let them declare it, and let it be clearly understood that this is what the people generally mean by the term Church. Let it also be known that this is the question at issue in treating of Mr. Gladstone's backslidings. For we maintain, as Mr. Gladstone himself taught us, that though—

“There is, indeed, an opinion sometimes held that the consecration of funds by states to the support of religion does not promote religion: such an opinion is the very acme of paradox, and is contradicted by the nearly universal practice of mankind.”

We also remember that Mr. Gladstone once penned this remonstrance :—

“It is very clear that these later times have been parents to an opinion that Government ought to exercise no choice in matters of faith, but leave every man, without advice, or aid, or influence from that source, to choose for himself. And many hold this opinion under an idea that the overthrow of national establishments, as such, will be beneficial to pure and undefiled religion. *They hold and contend thus, quite undisturbed in their convictions by the ominous and yet undeniable fact that they share them with all the enemies of law both human and Divine.* They know not the acuteness of Satanic instinct. May they become alive to it while there is yet time.”

I will not say that all Churchmen would swear to every sentiment of that extract, but it embraces the current opinion relative to the connexion between national establishments and religion. Is it, then, for the promotion of religion, and therefore for the Established National Church, that Mr. Gladstone is anxious to do his best? If so, he adopts a very peculiar mode of treatment. If so, then, although it can hardly be said of the Church, *Deesse inimicos*, it may assuredly be said of her, *Per amicos opprimi*.

But Mr. Gladstone has also taught us other reasons for upholding the Established Church.

"I hold," said he, "that, when the connexion of religion with the State has been destroyed, Government becomes essentially godless."

Again, in summing up his conclusions on that head, he thus wrote :—

"In the separation, then, of religion from Government we see a change which seems to indicate the progressive ripening of those harvests which are in preparation, the one for the love, and the other for the vengeance of the Lord. *Firstly, because it asserts practical Atheism* ; that is, a human agency knowingly, deliberately, and permanently divested of regard to God. Secondly, because it asserts that Atheism in the most authentic form ; namely, by casting out its antagonist, religion, from what are most permanent and most authoritative among men, their public politics. Thirdly, because the assertion is made, not by individuals alone, but by masses, invested with political power, and, under the most wretched infatuation, claiming it as a right of freedom thus to banish themselves from the Divine protection and regard."

Here, again, Mr. Gladstone has suggested excellent reasons for upholding the Established Church. And, I repeat, that is what the public mean and what they wish to uphold. It is also that which Mr. Gladstone is returned for Oxford University to uphold. His friends, therefore, would do well to prove that he wishes and intends to, and actually does uphold the Established Church. But if it is not the Established Church which he wishes and intends to uphold, but merely the dogmas of Tractarianism, then I fear that both he and his friends are not only paltering with us in a

double sense, but have been for years the parties to an "organized hypocrisy," for destroying that which he was clothed with authority to sustain and perpetuate.

In thus insisting upon the fact that it is the Established Church, and not merely the Church of England, that Mr. Gladstone is called upon to support, I have no doubt some redoubtable champion of Gladstonism will object that I am but another of those—

"Tories who know nothing of the Church as the Body of Christ and the Regenerator of His people, having a life of her own, independent of Acts of Parliament."

Certainly I know nothing, and hope to know nothing, of that image set up by Tractarians, either as a Church or an Established Church. Never yet could I understand, and I do not wish to understand, the Church, if Dr. Newman's view of the 39 Articles is the right one. He held, and I suppose all Tractarians hold, that in those Articles—

"The *Catholic teaching* of the early centuries was not condemned; that the *dominant errors*, the *actual popular beliefs and usages* sanctioned by Rome in the countries in communion with it, were condemned; and as to the *formal dogmas* of Rome, as contained in the later councils, especially the Council of Trent, and as condensed in the creed of Pope Pius IV., that some were, some were not, condemned, and that the line had to be drawn between them."

Of any Church teaching such doctrines, I allow, and gladly, that Tories, as a body, know nothing; but when

we speak of the Church of England as caricatured neither by Tractarians nor Calvinists, but as her whole Prayer Book portrays her, then I venture to think that Tories in general know more about her than fanatical Tractarians. And it is because they both understand that Church, and desire to support and propagate her religion as being the most effectual means for regenerating the people, that they also aim at upholding her in her present high position as the Established Church of the realm.

For Mr. Gladstone has taught us not only that national establishments do promote religion, but that, when the Church is united with the State, as in England—

“The most devoted piety enjoys in the Church a climate not less genial than elsewhere, and that, from the comparative independence of her position, *she is also peculiarly adapted for the permanent conservation of Divine truth.*”

Again, Mr. Gladstone has said, even of Church Rates, that their unconditional abolition—

“Would be to destroy the maintenance of the Church in certain cases, and, in others, to take their daily bread out of the mouths of the incumbents.”

What, then, would be the effect of pure voluntarism universal “in an age of religious parsimony?” But if we have Mr. Gladstone’s testimony to the effect that an Established Church is needful alike for promoting

religion, for conserving purity of doctrine, and for the support of the clergy, then in upholding the Established Church the Tories are also the best defenders of the Church in her purely spiritual character. But, this being the case, and Mr. Gladstone being our authority upon the subject, what more do his apologists want? Their own high priest has graciously deigned to bless and ratify the very means for upholding the Church adopted by the Tories, namely, by upholding the Establishment. Receiving, then, the high approbation of the chief priest, why need the Tories care for the baseless reproaches of mere acolytes?

To return. As yet we have only partially viewed the manifold phenomena of Mr. Gladstone's political transformation. In 1859 he, for the first time, became an open pervert to Liberalism. Now what has been the history of Liberalism since the Reform Bill, in its relations with the Established Church? On this point I refer again to Mr. Gladstone's testimony. Consult his speeches from 1833 to 1841 inclusive. Observe, however, the question is not what Liberalism has done, but what it meditated and attempted to do.

That the Irish Church still exists; that the Bishops sit in the Peers; that Church Rates are not abolished; that Dissenters do not participate in the government and permanent endowments of the Universities; that, indeed, the Established Church yet remains among our national institutions,—is not owing to the forbearance, or good-will, or active support of Liberal politicians.

This is a matter too frequently overlooked, I fear, by the apologists of Mr. Gladstone. But can they deny the proposition that, had Liberalism worked out all its will and designs, the Established Church would ere this have been a thing of the past ?

Mr. Gladstone, however, has not only become a pervert to Liberalism, but has come forth as the champion of ultra-Liberalism, that is, of democratic theories. It is not merely on Church questions that this statement holds good. On both Finance and Reform Mr. Gladstone is a disciple of Democracy. The same authority which last autumn announced, though not publicly, I believe, that his fatal decision was taken on the Irish Church, has also proclaimed that he is a convert to the Democratic theory of direct taxation, and of course a permanent income-tax. That authority is his own brother and twin-renegade, Mr. Robertson Gladstone.

On Reform, again, Mr. Gladstone has taken up a position even in front of many of his Democratic allies. But what seems somewhat singular is the persistent obliviousness of his Church and clerical friends to the immediate bearing of Reform upon the separation of Church and State. Is this another indication of their wish and intention to drop the Establishment, and combine for the propagation of Anglicanism, pure and simple ? If so, I say again, let them be more honest and open and straightforward in their professions.

It is not my intention, however, to point out at length the connexion between Reform and the separation of

Church and State, that is, the overthrow of the Established Church. This was the main object of my treatise entitled "Dissent and Democracy;" and I have never yet seen either the statements or the inferences in that work disputed, much less disproved; yet it was handled pretty freely in the columns of the Dissenting and Democratic press.

But, for the edification of Mr. Gladstone's friends, I may state that the fundamental principle of the Anti-State Church party is, and for 20 years has been, the separation of Church and State by means of political Reform. This will be made plain by a speech delivered at the Liberation Society's Annual Meeting in 1857, by that Mr. W. J. Fox whose sentiments Mr. Gladstone adopted in 1847.

"We have a new Parliament," said he, "more extensively committed than any, perhaps, that has come before it, to the cause of Parliamentary Reform; but he must be a very sanguine man indeed who expects without it to realize the great objects of this meeting—the liberation of religion from State patronage. *Political Reform is the broad highway in which we must march to religious freedom and equality. There is no shorter road; there is no better path.*"

What is Mr. Miall's creed?

"*Help forward the suffrage,*" said he, in 1852, on the platform of the Liberation Society—" *Help forward the suffrage whenever you can; help forward the separation of Church and State whenever you can; but, if you cannot do both, help forward the suffrage, and the other will be secure.*"

In 1859, again, at the Fifth Triennial Conference of

the Anti-State Church Association, a resolution was passed, stating, among other things, that—

“The Conference more especially anticipates the increased responsibility which will devolve upon the friends of religious equality when, by an extension of the franchise, political power will be given to large numbers who, it is believed, will be prepared to employ it in furtherance of the Society’s objects.”

Suppose, then, Mr. Gladstone’s principle of 1864 on the franchise was carried out; suppose even the £6 borough franchise was established; what would be the consequence? In the first session of such a Reformed Parliament I believe that Church Rates would be abolished for ever. I also believe that the person to propose that measure would be Mr. Gladstone.

Neither could the Lords any longer interpose their veto; for, as has been wisely ruled, it is not their part to resist a continued and deliberately expressed public opinion for ever, but to check hasty legislation. Besides, with another 20 years of Liberal government, the House of Lords will be a mere echo of Liberalism, supposing the creations to average the ratio of the last 20 or 30 years.

Before quitting this subject I cannot refrain from noticing the corroboration my view receives from a letter of Mr. Bright to the late Lord Mayor of Dublin. What was Mr. Bright’s specific for the removal of the Irish Church? It was what he termed “an honest amendment of the representation.” In first, therefore, advocating Reform in 1864, and then, in 1865, denounc-

ing the Irish Church, Mr. Gladstone was acting upon the policy both of Mr. Bright and the Anti-State Church party generally, which, since 1844, at least, whilst making the separation of Church and State its ultimate aim, has also marked out political Reform as the shortest road and best path—in fact, the broad highway in which to march to religious equality.

In joining himself, then, to Liberalism, Mr. Gladstone joined a party which, for the last 35 years, has notoriously originated and conducted every attack that has been made upon the Established Church. That those attacks have been neither few nor transient, nor of small import, even his own history testifies. Since his junction, moreover, with that party, Mr. Gladstone's own career only shows that a necessity is upon it of continuing those attacks.

And now I wish to ask how those attacks have been worsted. Have they fallen through of themselves? Were they abandoned voluntarily, and without any antagonist standing forth to resist them? What is the history of the Appropriation Clause, of Church Rates, of Endowed Schools Bills, of a dozen other measures aimed designedly at the privileges of the Established Church? Were all or any of those schemes abandoned by the Liberal party simply because they did not wish, though having the power, to carry them? Why, then, did they originate such schemes? Is it not rather the truth that all such schemes were given up because the loyalty and devotion of the Conservative party to the Church forbade all hope of their being carried?

Hence, as I said before, in judging of what Liberalism is capable of doing for the Church, we must consider not what it has done, so much as what it has endeavoured to do, but has been prevented from accomplishing through the vigilance and activity, and sometimes thankless services, of the Conservative party, in behalf of the Church.

Mr. Gladstone, however, it is pretended, could not possibly have joined the Conservative ranks. Certainly not, in his present character. But the main obstacle at one time, possibly, was the want of success to that party. At all events, between the Toryism of Sir H. Inglis and the creed of the Anti-State Church and Democratic party, there was surely some stopping-place. Not that I could allow that there is any for Mr. Gladstone. He has gone to his own, and his own have received him.

But when his simple-minded apologists talk about "the narrow grooves of Toryism," and "his profound views and firm grasp of principles" having no place there, do they forget that, for nearly half the allotted term of man's natural life, Mr. Gladstone was a Tory of the Tories, brought up, indeed, in the strictest sect, and walking in the narrowest groove of Toryism?

The peculiar aggravation, however, of Mr. Gladstone's case remains to be noticed. Briefly, it is this: many years previous to his perversion he had not only anticipated, but had most faithfully and accurately mapped out, the very operations which the Anti-State Church

party would plan and execute, in their assaults upon the Established Church. Now these operations have actually been carried on; but who is the leader of the besieging party? Under whose direction are the operations conducted? I answer, Under Mr. Gladstone's.

This is the way in which Mr. Gladstone foreshadowed the attainment of "a fatal decision" on the union of Church and State :—

"We should first be called to do, in our law and policy, what has been already done in reference to personal qualifications for office; to generalize and relax our obligations; to contemplate, in what is deemed a liberal spirit, the advancement, not merely of the interests of the Church, but of religion at large, under the different forms of it bearing the Christian name."

Again—

"We may, therefore, more probably anticipate that the next attempt to constitute society without a God, and to erase His name from the world which His might and His beneficence have made, will be more crafty and considerate, requiring time for its development, and a preparation consisting, not merely, like that in France, of suffering, but embracing a thorough education of the understanding and expansion of its powers. Yet all this devilish machinery may wear a very smooth appearance, drawing upon 'the deceivableness of unrighteousness' for all its resources of illusion, and soothing us with the belief that we are but ridding the earth of bigotry and persecution, establishing human freedom, and therein rendering to God the most acceptable service, while we are, in fact, immolating the faith and the truth, and with them all our own hopes and destinies of good."

Again, Mr. Gladstone noted, among the ominous symptoms of his time, up to 1842—

"A lukewarmness or a timidity, on the part of some in high office, deeply pledged to our institutions, or even an adoption of notions involving the *seminal* principle of their entire overthrow and abandonment, and preparing us to fear that, should the Church become, in a secular view, less popular and strong, and should men be called upon to suffer for her sake, we may expect to see these notions carried out by those who dally with them, or by their successors, to their results."

Mark, again, the following declarations :—

"The passing away of influence from definite station and privilege to the mere possession of property, and the increased facility of its acquisition, or, at least, its increased diffusion, have rendered it of late infinitely more difficult than formerly to attain the end of security to an Established Church by exclusion of dissidents from civil office ; because political influence depends very considerably upon property, and will, therefore, be felt in the Legislature even when the holder of property is excluded."

Again—

"The growth of the opinion that political privilege is in itself valuable, and among the natural rights of man, of course renders it infinitely more invidious to withhold that privilege than when it was viewed as matter of positive burden, or as attainable only or mainly by inheritance, or, in a conscientious view, as a possession of which the responsibility greatly outweighs the enjoyment. Men must have a positive value for the Church before they can be expected to forego, on her account, without dissatisfaction, that for which they have a positive value ; and this we can hardly expect of the general mass of Dissenters in their state of information and of feeling."

Nevertheless Mr. Gladstone concluded that—

"Our country seems to promise, at least, a more organized, tenacious, and determined resistance to the efforts *against*

national religion, as well as to the general principles of Democracy, than any other country which is prominent upon the great stage of the civilized world."

These sentiments, again, on qualifications, human freedom, seminal principles, political privileges, and Democracy, I leave the reader to contrast, not only with Mr. Gladstone's recent views and policy, but with the miserable apologies invented to palliate that policy by his officious friends. This only I would add, that we have Mr. Gladstone's evidence to the fact that he—

"Intended these arguments and convictions as his offering towards the elucidation and establishment of the Truth, whatever it may prove to be. He has followed what appeared to be her light to the point whither it appeared to lead him. For the last six years* he has watched the subject, in its practical, as well as its speculative forms, with the deepest earnestness, and has endeavoured to give his whole mind to the lessons with which they have abounded."

I may remark, however, that Mr. Gladstone made the same professions three years subsequently, in 1841; so that for nine consecutive years his book on "The State in its Relations with the Church" was—

"His offering towards the elucidation and establishment of the Truth."

I must also observe, with respect to Mr. Gladstone's speech in 1864 on the £6 Borough Franchise Bill, that he had had the experience of a previous Reform Bill

* This was written in 1838.

in forming an opinion of the consequences of a wholesale reduction of the franchise upon the union of Church and State. That either the Church or the House of Peers, indeed, would survive the Bill of 1832, appeared in 1833, at least, very problematical. Certain it is that, had Mr. Gladstone's present Democratic allies had their way, both the Established Church and our hereditary Peerage would have disappeared at once. Even Mr. Baines, whose Borough Franchise Bill, and something more, was so vehemently advocated by Mr. Gladstone in 1864, is an hereditary Anti-State Church partisan. And, though not one of the "hip-and-thigh" party in that medley of zealots, I find it stated, in a periodical of the time, that Mr. Baines's milder enthusiasm for Democracy once found vent in proposing to *his brethren*, "Three groans for the Queen" (Queen Adelaide).

So much, then, with reference to Mr. Gladstone's recreancy, and its special characteristics, in time, manner, degree, and other associations. To conclude this part of our summary, and introduce a climax, it only remains to append the following emphatic protestation:—

"I have a strong conviction," said Mr. Gladstone, in 1845, "speaking under ordinary circumstances, and as a general rule, that those who have borne the most solemn testimony to a particular view of a great constitutional question ought not to be parties responsible for proposals which involve a material departure from them."

The extravagant panegyrics of injudicious friends, ever obtruding upon us their idol as, in all things, *justissimum unum et servantissimum æqui*, require that we should also press home a few secondary considerations, obvious enough to any one conversant with Mr. Gladstone's career.

It may be laid down as a general law, I think, that, when rightly formed, a man's opinions and principles mostly grow stronger and deeper with advancing years. Generally speaking, moreover, men become more and more Conservative as they get older, and very naturally. What, then, is to be said of him who not only casts off all his original principles after attaining the prime of life, but, from being a High Tory up to that time, then gradually, but rapidly, drifts away into the antithesis of what he was? At one period or the other, surely, and probably at both, there must be some great mistake, something radically at fault, in such a character.

What are the fruits of that seed? I have already remarked upon that singular propensity of Mr. Gladstone for appealing to his position as the chosen representative of the clergy and the University of Oxford whenever he supports a measure peculiarly distasteful to the clergy and the University. How often has it happened, since 1847, that the most Conservative constituency in the country has been actually forced to advance measures most detrimental, as it conceived, to the interests of the Church, the Universities, and Con-

servatism ! In such a case does not its representative become an *exemplum citius imitabile* ?

How often, indeed, has Mr. Gladstone's example swayed others to support what otherwise they would have opposed, or *vice versa* ! How often have even Conservatives bowed before his authority and example since 1847, notwithstanding their own misgivings ! But yet his advocates have the modesty to turn round, and, because, on one or two occasions, one or two Conservatives have followed Mr. Gladstone's example, owing to his connexion with Oxford University, to accuse the whole party of complicity in such proposals. Thus the most damning testimony to the pernicious effects of Mr. Gladstone's ambiguous relations and career is perverted into proof of his being, after all, as good a Conservative, not only as those who vote with him, but as the party generally. This, too, is done in the teeth of the evident fact that it is only on one or two questions that Mr. Gladstone does vote against his colleagues ; upon which occasions, nevertheless, he is a simple unit in the division-list or the debate, not a great Government power, as on all other questions.

It ought also to be remembered that even his votes and speeches are only on the negative side of Church defence. In spite of all Mr. Gladstone's suggestions and protestations, since 1849, upon the subject of Church Rates, I am not aware of a single definite or tangible proposal of his to settle the question. The same remark holds good in respect to other Church questions upon

which he has repeatedly professed a desire to legislate; yet Mr. Gladstone has been twice a Cabinet Minister since those professions were made.

The case of Mr. Gladstone's personal friends, who are also Conservatives, and electors of Oxford University, is peculiarly unpleasant. How are they to serve two masters—"how divide the frailty from the friend?" But it is not merely his private friends and Parliament whose confidence is thus abused: Mr. Gladstone's example is an outrage upon political morality. Above all, it has a tendency, direct and immediate, to corrupt the minds of young men, and especially of those from whom are to spring the future generations of statesmen, and lawyers, and prelates—the members of the two Universities; for Mr. Gladstone, as in other things he loves to be conspicuous, so is he *splendide mendax*.

When we consider, indeed, all his eccentric foibles and audacious freaks, his representation of Oxford University is a mystery. Is there another living politician who could "stump" the same constituency, within a few years, on the Conservative and Liberal interests alternately, as Mr. Gladstone did Flintshire? Who, moreover, whilst sitting for the University of Oxford, could receive a deputation of all the local Democratic forces combined, imploring him to contest South Lancashire? Or who, whilst voting himself against the abolition of Church Rates, could support, both in Flintshire and South Lancashire, the candidate pledged to their immediate unconditional abolition?

The fact is, that no constituency in the kingdom would tolerate such proceedings, except the University of Oxford—that very constituency which, before all others, is charged with the moral education of public men. Mr. Cardwell, for one single misdemeanour, one single act of bad faith to his constituents, was rejected in 1852 by Liverpool. Sir J. Graham may be said to have sat for different constituencies every Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, after nearly 20 years of violated engagements, after acts innumerable of commission as well as of omission, absolutely contrary to the terms of the trust confided to him, still sits for the University of Oxford. Nay, it would appear as though he valued that connexion before all others, because it enables him to follow out his crooked courses with the surest guarantee for impunity.

Hence the more than suspicion so commonly entertained of Oxford. Mr. Gladstone's example is a reflection, not only upon its politics, but upon its morality and its religion. He is, moreover, the very source and fountain, not only of endless divisions there, but more particularly of that last development of Liberalism enshrined in the "Essays and Reviews." Yet, as Cæsar's wife should not be suspected, so we have a right to expect that any representative for the University of Oxford should be above reproach. The laboured apologies of Mr. Gladstone's advocates, therefore, only prove that there is something in his position essentially wrong.

As to Mr. Gladstone himself, notwithstanding the

collapse of one whole structure of opinions and principles, he seems to have as much self-confidence as ever. He is just as positive and dogmatic in 1865, when he argues upon the unsatisfactory position of the Irish Church, as he was up to 1842, when he maintained the opposite thesis. He is equally fearless, not to say reckless, in forming and in uttering his opinions, in the one case and in the other; yet, the slightest contradiction or discrepancy in a court of justice nullifies the evidence of the most truthful witness.

Let it also be remarked that no one has been more severe than Mr. Gladstone in his comments upon the inconsistencies and backslidings of others, though wholly imaginary, or, at all events trifling, compared with his own. In the year 1837, when discussing the Government Church Rate Bill, he ventured to expostulate with Lord J. Russell, as follows :—

“Was this paltering with principles worthy of a statesman? Was it consonant with that regard to the dictates of uncompromising rectitude, which ought to govern his conduct?”

In 1840, also, in reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, Mr. Gladstone, in his Tory zeal, so far forgot his hierarchical superstitions as to exclaim—

“He should like to know whether the opinion expressed in those recommendations (of the Archbishop and Bishop) had or had not been maintained by them all their lives, or whether they had been suddenly adopted!”

Now, suppose a series of charges such as I have enumerated could be as justly imputed to any leading Conservative, with what pious grief and holy anger would he not be visited by Mr. Gladstone's apologists? Read his weekly organ, as it carps with malignant spite at Lord Derby or Mr. Disraeli, and you will best understand the sublime art of straining at a gnat and swallowing the camel. As we peruse, indeed, in the columns of the *Guardian*, the doleful lament over Lord Palmerston's or Earl Russel's peccadilloes, especially when set forth in the full blaze of Mr. Gladstone's perfections, we cannot fail to exclaim, with the poet,

"Multi
Committunt eadem diverso crimina fato;
Ille crucom sceleris tulit, hic diadema."

It may, in short, be questioned whether anything so unscrupulous as Mr. Gladstone's paper could be found in the range of literature, except, perhaps, in his own speeches.

Do I, then, question Mr. Gladstone's motives? That query I leave every individual to answer as he pleases. My duty is to state facts for their guidance. Certain it is that in his first work Mr. Gladstone took note of

"A lukewarmness or a timidity on the part of some in high office deeply pledged to our institutions, or even an adoption of notions involving the seminal principle of their entire overthrow and abandonment, and preparing us to fear that, should the Church become, in a secular view, less popular and strong, and should men

be called upon to suffer for her sake, we may expect to see these notions carried out by those who dally with them, or by their successors, to their results."

Has, then, Mr. Gladstone ever exhibited a lukewarmness or timidity, or an adoption of notions involving the seminal principle of the entire overthrow and abandonment of our institutions? Has he ever dallied with such notions? Has, moreover, the Church become, in a secular view, less popular and strong of late years? or would she become, in a secular view, less popular and strong, supposing Mr. Gladstone's Reform dogmas were acted upon to their consequences? If so, then we can plainly see that there would be for him a *facilis transitus ad proximos et validiores*.

That hypothesis is strengthened by another consideration. Up to 1842, at least, Mr. Gladstone was notorious for his unpopular tenets, and his resolute exposure of himself to obloquy in consequence. Macaulay gave it as his opinion, in 1839, that

"It would not be at all strange if Mr. Gladstone were one of the most unpopular men in England."

But all that is changed, and we are only tempted to moralize on the blindness of human kind as we read of it. Who is it that now fills the columns of cheap newspapers? Whose name figures in all addresses and speeches of popular orators? Who was it, indeed, that found a resolution of the House of Commons on the paper duties imperative, but another resolution

on fire insurance not only impertinent but unconstitutional? Who, again, reduced the advertisement duty? Were not these popular acts? Has not Mr. Gladstone studied other popular acts? Can he any longer say—

“Non ego ventosæ plebis suffragia venor
Impensis cœnarum et tritæ numere vestis?”

Whatever, then, be his motives, we shall be justified in saying either that Mr. Gladstone no longer regards those who in government represent the mere will of the people, as “helots or slaves,” or that he himself has become a helot and slave.

It will be said, however, that we have ample security for motives in Mr. Gladstone’s religion. Doubtless it is very convenient, and has a fine effect, on the whole, when, upon incurring an ugly suspicion, a man can put in the demurrer—

“Sum pius Æneas,—”

That process is still more easy and agreeable if the individual suspected can complacently add—

“famâ super æthera notus.”

But I confess there appears to be a vast amount of piety or religion nowadays, which might be considerably improved by a larger infusion of common morality and native honesty; and I should decline to take any man’s religion as security for his integrity, if it were made up simply of “the life-giving ordinances” of Tractarianism.

Charles II. pronounced Romanism to be the religion of a gentleman; that is, I suppose, of a gentleman of his stamp. But, next to that gentlemanly religion, we must in justice class Tractarianism. This system contains no less than four distinct species of what may be termed the gentleman class of doctrines.

In the first place, the Tractarian theory of private judgment, which resolves itself into mere conformity with the teaching of the Church, is eminently calculated to foster a gentlemanly indolence of intellect and thought. Prove all things, says the Tractarian, by all means, but never disapprove of what Holy Church enjoins. Then comes the *Economia*—evasion and equivocation reduced to an exact science—another most gentlemanly accomplishment. In the third place, there is “the mystical or sacramental principle,” by which everything we see or know is a phenomenon or a phantasm. In this view the whole universe, and all that it inhabit, constitute one grand, impalpable, symbolical phantasmagoria, a species of everlasting dissolving view. Now that also is really a gentlemanly dogma. What a world of trouble it would save a man if he could only transform, as if by wizard wand, all the stern realities of daily life into an allegory! It seems, however, passing strange that, whilst everything else above, around, about, below, was mere probability, the dogmas of Tractarianism should be deemed so real, so substantive, so immutable. In the end, alas! they, too, proved, not only in Dr. Newman’s case, but in that of too many others, a part

of the universal phantasmagoria, a mere pageant, indeed, unsubstantial as the baseless fabric of a vision. Finally, and as a last refuge for the gentleman, Tractarianism provides the pleasing sacrifice of penances, an atonement for any gentlemanly peccadilloes.

Such a system, it appears to me, is admirably suited to debauch the national character. In fact, if we would judge of the tree by its fruits, we need only refer back to the court and courtiers of the Stuart period; we should then see enough of the gentility, such as it was, of Tractarianism. Such a system, I maintain, undermines the very foundation of personal religion, by subjecting the internal conscience to the decrees of external authority. Under such a system the question of motives has no place. Conscience is a convenience: having once been trained to obedience, it becomes obsequious and servile,

“*Tortum digna sequi potius quam ducere funem.*”

It is, then, the will which commands, and will mostly serves self-interest. Thus, acting under the instincts of Tractarianism, a man is most likely to act under the impulses of his own natural desires. *Vitiosa libido facit auspicium.*

In Mr. Gladstone's case, such a system is calculated to exert an influence most pernicious. Doubtless he was, partly at least, describing himself when he spoke of it as being—

“The one barrier which effectually closes the way to Romanism to persons of an ardent, and, at the same time, a confiding spirit.”

But these are the very persons to need a more robust creed, a creed which shall teach them how to exercise their intellect and reason, without stifling those faculties, in the concerns of religion.

The same analogy holds good in religion as in education. In both cases it is sound philosophy which bids us pursue, not that which is most to the taste, or that for which our natural talents are best adapted, but that which will tend to train and perfect the whole man, so as neither to leave any great vacuum nor produce any overflow, if we would make the individual in every respect *totus, teres, atque rotundus*.

I say, then, that Mr. Gladstone's religion is no clue to his motives, nor any safeguard to his actions; for the former, they are possibly to him always pure and conscientious; but then his conscience is no guarantee. It is, in fact, his weakness, and the source of his foibles. If, having consulted his conscience, he asks himself the question, “Doest thou well to be angry?” I warrant he soon hears the answer, “I do well.” Nor will the other nostrums of Tractarianism, the Economica and the sacramental system, fail to influence for evil a mind naturally subtle, sophistical, and prone to abstractions.

But of all “the life-giving ordinances” of Tractarianism, I can well imagine that penance and mortification minister the most kindly alleviations to his per-

turbed, wayward spirit. After all the dubious and devious courses of his chequered life, I can easily conceive of Mr. Gladstone as withdrawing himself far away from the turmoil of politics, and deriving unspeakable consolation from a penitential pilgrimage among the Scotch peasantry, to whom he would discourse most wisely on the Episcopal succession and the properties of broths.

It will be objected, perhaps, that this quasi-digression is not only irrelevant but needlessly intrusive. If so, I appeal to Mr. Gladstone's own words in 1847, in which he insisted upon the intimate connexion that exists between religion and politics. That, moreover, there is something radically unsound in the Tractarian system, and that my conclusions are not without corroborative testimony to their correctness, is plain, I think, from the melancholy reflection that one generation, at least, of Oxford's most promising sons were swept away before the Tractarian avalanche, and dispersed over the face of the whole earth,—the majority seeking shelter in Romanism; some finding a covert from the storm in Latitudinarianism and Infidelity; others, tempest-tossed and shipwrecked, returning finally to the harbour whence they had set out; and a few pilgrims and wanderers still in quest of rest and finding none.

If, again, we cast our thoughts back to the Gladstonian era at Oxford, we shall find that, of his political contemporaries, most of those who started with him, equipped with the same freight of principles, have,

like himself, miscarried by the way. And I maintain that the same system of religious ordinances which landed the clergy at Rome, has had no small influence in drifting the Tractarian politicians on the shoals and shallows of a pseudo-Liberalism. Some, indeed, of the clergy who were once conspicuous as Tractarians, have likewise fallen away to Liberalism in politics as well as in religion.

Resuming our survey, however, we may be asked what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Is anything to be predicated for certain of Mr. Gladstone's character and principles and parts and future? If so, what? As to his character, I mean, of course, politically, Mr. Gladstone appears to me a moral chaos. His principles I believe to be thoroughly honourable and conscientious and—never to be trusted. In any estimate of his talents, his incomparable opportunities should first be carefully weighed. But, that he is blessed with rare endowments, both natural and acquired, it would be absurd to deny.

I cannot, however, so readily concede that Mr. Gladstone is an orator. He is more of a rhetorician than an orator; but I think his gift of speech may fitly be described as declamation seasoned by personalities. Those who judge of oratory by contemporaneous efforts, or by cheap novels, or cheaper newspapers, may mistake Mr. Gladstone's performances for oratory, but they must be content to rest under the imputation of knowing little or nothing of Chatham, or Pitt, or Fox, or

Burke, or Grattan, and less of Cicero or Demosthenes. Mr. Gladstone's speeches, in fact, are of the Euripidean cast—essentially “shoppish.” I very much question whether a single philosophical maxim could be found in the whole range of his productions. If, indeed, when perusing Mr. Gladstone's speeches, it were asked what I was reading, I should sum up my criticism and answer, in Hamlet's reply, “Words, words, words.”

His faculty, I should say, is that of imitation rather than creation. He is, in his inmost nature, a parasitical plant. To this characteristic, indeed, may be traced much of his instability of principle, which is quite as often a cause as a consequence. Hence it is that in his youth and first manhood, though brought up at home under the Evangelical system, Mr. Gladstone was easily seduced into the bye-paths of Anglicanism. The prop upon which he next rested was Sir R. Peel. For some years subsequent to his death, from, I may say, 1851 to 1859, Mr. Gladstone's course was as erratic as that of a labyrinth. At length he seemed to lean, for a while at least, against the pillars of Stafford House. But of late it would appear as though he were a client either of his brother's, Mr. Robertson Gladstone, or of Mr. Bright's. Does this betoken strength of mind?

It will be said, perhaps, that his budgets indicate something of the inventive faculty. Any person who will candidly revise his financial policy, however, will soon discover not only that whatever has been most successful was not his own, but that the various objec-

tionable and futile proposals, which were mostly either withdrawn or rescinded by the House of Commons, were Mr. Gladstone's own. In one sense, it is true, he is original—in his eccentricities, as, for instance, in his capricious dealings with that "immoral tax," which was to cease and determine in 1860, but which Mr. Gladstone's present policy aims at making perpetual. I may remark, indeed, of his financial experiments generally, that they faithfully illustrate and confirm the deductions we have drawn from his tortuous policy on constitutional questions.

That Mr. Gladstone's eccentricities, however, ought not to be regarded as proofs of a creative genius, is partly shown by another consideration. What is the most striking feature of his later development? What, indeed, is the one distinctive mark of all his greatest speeches? It is his skill in adaptation. No speaker studies his audience more; none strives to accommodate himself more to circumstances; none is at more pains so to assort and arrange his materials as to create the greatest sensation. John Bull has grown somewhat fastidious. He now requires to be coaxed. Whatever the viands may be, good, bad, or indifferent, let them be savoury.

And it must be allowed that, as a political cook, no one equals Mr. Gladstone. He knows well that, whoever supplies the materials, it is he who serves them up with the most delectable flavour, to whom the merit of the repast is attributed, whether it belong to him or no.

Take, for example, that dish called the £6 Borough Franchise. How often was it not prepared by Earl Russell? Yet he won to himself small credit. But when Mr. Gladstone invoked his gastronomic art, how wondrous the success! The effect, indeed, reminds one of that scene in the *Knights* where *Ἀλλαντοπώλης* having stolen the dainty piece of hare brought by *Βυρσοπώλης*, and having presented it to old *Δῆμος*, the latter exclaims to Cleon:—

ἄπιθ'· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ τοῦ παραθέντος ἡ χάρις.

That passage is one which I doubt not has occurred to Mr. Gladstone. At all events, no one seems more apt at taking the hint. I cannot, however, reconcile that art of adaptation with the possession of strong, original, creative genius. It is some sign, I grant, of the rapid descent of Mr. Gladstone down the steep of Democracy.

On the whole, as hinted before, it would seem that Mr. Gladstone's talents and disposition fitted him for another calling than that of a politician. It has been said that his original intention and inclination pointed to the clerical profession, and the perusal of his works will show that that was his most natural vocation. That he is or can be a philosophical statesman has been most effectually disproved by his unphilosophical career. That he partakes largely even of the ordinary characteristics of an Englishman, no one, I think, would venture to maintain. But his ardent zeal, his confiding

disposition, his gift of tongues, his vehemence, his impatience of opposition, his sacerdotal temper, his devotion to dogma, would have admirably fitted him for one profession—that of a Jesuit.

At the same time it must be owned that Mr. Gladstone's faults and foibles have all been fostered and magnified by that incessant offering of the incense of adulation, which misjudging admirers daily augment. Such an offering is one which describes the subject of our notice, "Oxford's Representative," as—

" Her Champion, double-first in every sense,
Conduct and courage, skill and eloquence,
Orator, Statesman, Scholar, Wit, and Sage,
The Crichton—more, the *Gladstone* of the age."

To prevent, however, any ill effects from that dose, I may add that it is perfectly harmless: it is merely an emetic by the author of "Proverbial Philosophy."

What, however, of Mr. Gladstone's future? Possibly its complexion may vary a little with the relations between him and the University of Oxford. A tinge of indecision may mark his course, if that connexion be renewed. Meanwhile the University must be content to compromise its own reputation; the Church, like the patriarch of old, is sold into captivity by its natural guardians; public morality is doomed to receive a ruder shock; and Mr. Gladstone himself, unless he make full and open confession of his intentions, will only bring upon himself a heavier load of opprobrium. For, after

all, by a continuance of his relations with the University, the end is simply deferred, not averted.

In 1829 Mr. Keble and his friends opposed Sir R. Peel and returned as his substitute Sir H. Inglis, on the ground of the former's "change of policy as dictated by Liberalism." Now, Mr. Gladstone has been a Liberal, in the Tractarian sense of the word, for some 20 years at least, and since 1859 he has gone over to "Political Liberalism" as well, the parallel and concurrent action of which he declared, up to 1842, aids in producing the same results as

"That principle of religious Liberalism into which Protestantism is apt to degenerate."

How, then, can Mr. Keble, after visiting the one venial relapse of Sir R. Peel so severely, come forth not only to palliate Mr. Gladstone's countless transgressions, but to advocate his re-election for the University, in the name of Prudence, Justice, Oxford, and the Church? Is Mr. Keble a pervert to Liberalism? Has he, too, gone away? Or is it that when he speaks of the Church, he means the Church viewed merely as a religious denomination and not as an Establishment, and that he is prepared to sacrifice the temporalities, under the idea of preserving the dogmas? If so, and if, with that view, the Tractarian-Gladstone party are ready to join hands with the Liberation Society to pull down the Established Church, let them make open profession of their views and wishes. Let them declare themselves now, before

the next General Election, so that the electors may no longer be liable to be duped and circumvented.

To adopt Mr. Gladstone's own words, some intimation should be given of the results at which it is intended they should finally arrive, so that the electors and the public should not be required to embark on an ocean of political change, without knowing the haven for which they are bound. To Mr. Gladstone, at least, may fairly be addressed the remonstrance, *quod diu parturit animus, aliquando pariat*. Long, too long, has his been what he himself depicted—

“The predicament of men who live from day to day by shifts and expedients; of men who use arguments, the real tendency of which they are unable to perceive.”

But, whatever the relations between Mr. Gladstone and the University of Oxford, they cannot undo what has been done, nor seriously or permanently influence the future. Some persons, I believe, conceive it possible for Mr. Gladstone, *actus maria omnia circum*, to make again for that Tory harbour whence he first set sail. That, however, I deem the most improbable of all probabilities.

On the three great questions of civil policy Mr. Gladstone has committed himself, beyond redemption, to democratic innovations—on the relations between Church and State, on Reform, and on Finance. By his own admissions he has also deliberately surrendered what was necessary for the maintenance of the British

constitution. Those, moreover, with whom he has allied himself, or whose measures he supports, glory in the avowal that their object is to establish a democratic polity both in civil and ecclesiastical affairs, and that Mr. Gladstone's concessions are the means to that end. If, indeed, there be any boundary beyond which a limited constitutional monarchy is impossible, and will be superseded by a democratic form of government of some kind or other, it is surely that laid down in Mr. Gladstone's speech in 1864, on the Borough Franchise Bill.

The issue then raised by Mr. Gladstone is an issue of vital fundamental principles of government. Neither can it be doubted into which scale his destiny is thrown. Ever since Toryism was abandoned, his ultimate fate was certain. He could never stop short of some other abstraction. But the only proper antithesis to Toryism is the Democratic Theory. Conservatism and Liberalism are neither of them abstract theories. They are, in fact, but different forms of the principle of political expediency, and forms differing chiefly in degree and in the application of that principle. It was not in Mr. Gladstone, therefore, to remain at either position. He could no more set his creed at the point fixed by Sir R. Peel, than at the point fixed by Lord J. Russell. Having fallen from the lofty empyrean of Toryism, he was borne down by the weight of his own inexorable abstractions, through the upper regions of Conservatism and Liberalism, to that lowest pit of Democracy.

Not that I believe Mr. Gladstone to be at heart a demagogue, or even capable of an ardent devotion to democratic theories. In his speeches, and in that on the Irish Church in particular, he speaks not of his own convictions so much, as of the popular feeling and current sentiment. But then, he has acquired and practises the demagogue's art, and has placed himself in such a situation that no alternative is left except an alliance with the democratic faction. He has long ago closed his account with Toryism and Conservatism. The Whigs and moderate Liberals, however, both dislike and distrust him for other reasons, and because he is a *novus homo*. His only hope, therefore, is the Democrats, and, sooth to say, they seem not only fond of him but to trust him.

But the only chance for a democratic government is the wholesale reduction of the franchise. That being granted, Mr. Gladstone would soon be Premier, and Mr. Bright and Mr. Miall, I suppose, would be other two great lights in the Cabinet. Thus, by every impulse of ambition, and, moreover, by the *spretæ injuriæ formæ*—impulses which, in Mr. Gladstone's vision, doubtless assume the form of conscientious convictions—he is irrevocably committed to the bondage of Democracy, and has “lent the crowd his arm to shake the tree.” However parsimonious his youth and prime, the vice of his mature age is that of profusion. *Inopi juventâ, senex prodigus*. In his reckless haste, indeed, to pluck the fruit of democratic greed, Mr. Gladstone's

only fear appears to be lest he should be anticipated. His motto now is, *Occupet extremum scabies; mihi turpe relinqui est.*

But will that connexion last? Much depends upon the solution of the Reform question. If the £6 franchise be conceded, I can conceive of no difficulties intervening and interrupting that alliance; for, whatever else is doubtful, it is beyond all doubt that the £6 franchise is demanded by the Democrats, and as a concession to the democratic principle. And such a concession, I maintain, would smooth away the only remaining obstacle to complete harmony and union between Mr. Gladstone and the Democrats. What is that obstacle? It is not the Established Church; for that has been abandoned any time within the last 20 years. It is Mr. Gladstone's views of the Church as a religious system. As Dr. Newman *now* holds, that

“the national Church has hitherto been a serviceable break-water against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own,”

so of old he deemed the alliance of a dogmatic religion with Liberals at least incongruous.

This is Mr. Gladstone's present difficulty in the way of perfect identity and agreement with Democracy. Nothing is more clear than that, between it and Tractarian prudery, no terms could be made. Anglicanism neither is nor can be the creed of the active, thinking, independent middle-classes, from whom the democratic leaders mostly spring. Whatever else may be said of

them, they are not troubled with any superfluous veneration either for authority, or antiquity, or apostolicity, or for any other thing, save, perhaps, what Mr. Gladstone deems a monstrous heretical abuse, the right of private judgment. Besides, in Mr. Gladstone's creed, nearly the whole of the democratic party, as being rampant Dissenters, are also guilty, as a body, of the heinous crime of schism.

Here, then, there does seem some slight difficulty to any cordial co-operation between the respective parties ; but I cannot deem it insuperable. In presence of Mr. Gladstone's history, who shall say what is impossible? Who would deny that he might, some time or other, hold forth in a Quaker's meeting-house? or that he might prove a worthy successor to the late Mr. W. J. Fox, M.P., at Finsbury Chapel? Concede Mr. Gladstone's own basis of the suffrage, and then, who shall be faithless enough to doubt anything? The Democrats would then be masters of the situations, and they are not wont to be easy taskmasters. Under their yoke Mr. Gladstone would find, at length, that he could not for ever be permitted to adapt his phrases and sentiments to the purposes of the hour. Then, at least, he would have to clothe himself in some garb of stability, and not of his own choosing.

If, however, his desperate throw for manhood or universal suffrage prove unlucky, it is more than possible that Mr. Gladstone may then find himself again adrift, and in a condition to realize, politically, at least,

the poets' curse, *nec amet quemquam, nec ametur ab ullo*.

In any case, I fear it may be concluded, with only too much reason, of his future, that it will resemble the position of those thus described by the historian, *multi afflictâ fide in pace, ac turbatis rebus alacres et per incerta tutissimi*. With the alteration of a single letter we may say of Mr. Gladstone, what Thucydides records of "*that fierce Democratie*" of old—ὥστε εἴ τις αὐτοὺς ζυνελῶν φαίη πεφυκέναι ἐπὶ τῷ μήτε αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν μήτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους εἶναι, ὁρθῶς αὖν εἴποι.

THE END.

Now ready, in One Vol., post 8vo, 8s. 6d., cloth.

Dissent and Democracy;
THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS AND COMMON OBJECT.
An Historical Review.

BY RICHARD MASHEDER, B.A.,
Fellow, Magdalene College, Cambridge; and of the Inner Temple.

THE most complete History that has as yet appeared of Political Dissent—its Principles and Objects, its Organizations, its Party connections, and its Policy or Mode of Action—from the Revolution of 1688 up to the present time.

To the Electors of the United Kingdom, therefore, in prospect of an early Dissolution of Parliament, this Work will be found specially interesting, treating as it does upon all the prominent constitutional questions of the last thirty years, inclusive of the Session of 1864.

LONDON: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & CO.,
66, BROOK STREET, W.

AND WILLIAM MACINTOSH, 24, PATERNOSTER ROW.

DUBLIN: GEORGE HERBERT, GRAFTON STREET.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Mr. Masheder is evidently a young writer. But he is a scholar; his quotations are always apposite and seldom hackneyed; he writes a little too flowingly, perhaps, but in a pleasant style, and he always keeps to the point; moreover, he has the merit of having massed his facts very ably, and put his case with singular clearness."—*Saturday Review*.

"A masterly book on a very important question."—*Church Times*.

"A judicious and valuable digest of the relations which have hitherto

been maintained between Democracy and Dissent. Mr. Masheder's concluding chapter is extremely well worth reading, and replete with good sense."—*Press*.

"Mr. Masheder's book is full of valuable information, and bristles with cogent inference."—*Church Review*.

"We thank the author of this important volume, and we hope it will be read, both for its correct historical exhibition of Dissent, and also for its counsels to Churchmen."—*Clerical Journal*.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS—*continued.*

"We cannot take leave of Mr. Masheder without expressing our high opinion of the very able and conclusive manner in which he has dealt with this important subject. His book is written in so lively a style, and takes up the question in a manner so original, as to make the reader sympathize with him."—*St. James's Chronicle.*

"A perfect mirror of domestic history for thirty years past, it is the best electoral guide-book that can be compiled. It is, in fact, a complete 'hand-book' for electors. We may add, that the style of writing is at once easy, free, terse, vigorous, and manly."—*Standard.*

"Those who follow Mr. Masheder in his summary of the just relations between Dissent and Democracy will find, not only that he has given a very careful abstract of the constitutional questions of later times, but some very valuable historical facts."—*John Bull.*

"That worst of literary crimes—dulness—cannot be charged against Mr. Masheder; and even those who dissent from his opinions, and question the soundness of his counsel, may find his summary of the politico-ecclesiastical conflicts of the last few years both useful and interesting."—*London Review.*

"The Anti-State-Church agitation is graphically portrayed in all its successive phases of development; and, in fact, there is hardly a question which has come before Parliament, affecting, even remotely, the Established Church, in its relation to Dissent, which does not come under review."—*Record.*

"In prospect of an early dissolution of Parliament and a general election, for which Dissent has

made and is making extraordinary preparations to establish a solemn league and covenant with Liberalism against the Church and Conservatism, we hail Mr. Masheder's book as a production highly seasonable and serviceable, and happy alike in its conception and execution."—*Herald.*

"The review of political Dissent between 1688 and 1832 is very briefly disposed of. From this time downwards, however, Mr. Masheder cites the different political events of the period with an accuracy which shows that he is thoroughly master of his subject. The chapters on 'Dissent; its Past, Present, and Future', 'On the Position and Duties of Churchmen,' are peculiarly interesting and telling."—*Churchman.*

"Mr. Masheder's 'Dissent and Democracy' is a work well calculated to promote the purpose which its author has at heart. By proving that the spoilers of the Church are robbers of the poor, and that the end of the Anti-Church-rate party is the complete spoliation of the Church, Mr. Masheder contributes his part to rally round the standard of the Establishment all those who respect the sacredness of property, the rights of the poor, and the institutions of their country."—*Index.*

"Mr. Masheder has done good service both to Church and State. His book should be studied carefully by all to whom the established religion of the country, as such, is dear. The style is plain, terse, straightforward, and energetic; the matter practical and strictly to the purpose. To all who see in the mutual relations of Church and State the true bulwarks alike of liberty and religion, we most heartily

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS—*continued.*

commend the careful study of this work."—*Church and State Review.*

"If any one wishes to trace the policy of Dissenters against the Church, he cannot do better than procure Mr. Masheder's 'Dissent and Democracy.' It is a very complete and able work."—*Ecclesiastic.*

"Mr. Masheder is a vigorous writer. His book is full of instruction. He gives us his authorities, and very seldom takes his facts at second-hand. We must say that we think few candid readers, whether Churchmen or Dissenters, will read Mr. Masheder's volume without feeling that the clamours of Mr. Miall and his party are equally violent and unreasonable; and that their principles, if carried out, would be destructive to our constitution both in Church and State."—*Christian Observer.*

"The gradual approximation of the Radical and Dissenting sections of the House of Commons to each other, and of the Whigs to both, may be read in Mr. Masheder's pages with amusement and instruction. The most important point brought to light is the substantial identity of the Liberation Society with the 'Complete Suffrage Union.' Certain it is that, as Mr. Masheder shows, the Dissenting agitators now build their schemes for the 'separation of Church and State,' on 'the masses.'"—*Guardian.*

"To all interested in the constitutional government of this land of ours, the book will afford much instruction. The author handles several of the leading statesmen very cleverly."—*Leeds Intelligencer.*

"One great merit in the book, besides its literary excellence, is,

that the writer takes nothing for granted, nor expects that his readers will do so. Right or wrong, he gives full reason for the faith that is in him, and bases his arguments upon facts clearly stated."—*Birmingham Gazette.*

"It is impossible to overrate the importance of the facts and truths the author brings forward in support of his assertions. The publication of such a work, on the eve of a general election, is most opportune, and we trust the truths so ably set forth will have some effect in calling the attention of electors to the real issue of the forthcoming struggle."—*Newcastle Journal.*

"'Dissent and Democracy' is a work to be examined with attention by Churchmen of all schools, and by politicians of all parties, who are not really opposed to the interests of the constitution. Let our readers procure Mr. Masheder's book for themselves, and they will find sufficient there to surprise and arouse them."—*Liverpool Courier.*

"Churchmen and Constitution-
alists will do well to read this book. The whole question seems to us to be fairly and faithfully dealt with, and we have confidence in the issue being favourable to the Established Church when the reader is unbiassed. In the prospect of an immediate general election, vital questions to the voter here treated upon should receive due attention. To be forewarned is to be forearmed."—*Exeter Flying Post.*

"Mr. Masheder has undertaken and completed a work which we members of the Established Church much needed. The past and present operations of Dissent are fairly and truthfully set forth, and a

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS—*continued.*

good-sized volume is wound up with some sound well-considered advice as to the duties of Churchmen in the ensuing general election. We hope that this history of Dissent as a political institution may be widely read, that we Church people, knowing how we stand, may act as our knowledge would dictate to us."—*Cambridge Chronicle.*

"Mr. Masheder has done good service to Conservatism and the Church by this masterly exposure of the principles and objects of political Dissenters, both of the past and present age. We take leave of Mr. Masheder with the hope that his able treatise will have as wide a circulation as the importance of the subject deserves."—*Norfolk Chronicle.*

"An excellent work recently published by Mr. Masheder on Dissent and Democracy."—*Worcester Journal.*

"We heartily commend Mr. Masheder's book. In its examination of political Dissent it is most thorough and complete. It is instinct with life and reason, from the first page to the last. It deals a crushing blow at the efforts and aims of the Liberation Society and its Democratic allies, and is a sure arm of defence against the open or insidious foes of the Constitution. It is a book that ought to be freely circulated, particularly in view of the coming election. The Liberation Society then purpose to make their grand advance against Church and State: let the public but be acquainted with the facts put forth in this volume, and the Liberation Democrats will find themselves ignominiously defeated."—*Denbighshire and Flintshire Telegraph.*

"A searching investigation of

the character of the Liberation Society and its avowed objects. The author has produced a mass of evidence never collected before."—*Coventry Standard.*

"Mr. Masheder's book has made its appearance very opportunely, to prepare Churchmen of all sections for the systematic attack with which the Establishment is menaced at the approaching general election. Nothing can be more masterly and complete than its exposure of the tactics of the Liberation Society, nothing more earnest and convincing than its counsel for foiling them. It is to be hoped that Churchmen and Conservatives will avail themselves freely of Mr. Masheder's armory in the inevitable conflict which threatens them."—*Oxford Journal.*

"It is matter of sincere congratulation that one who is both an exact thinker, a powerful writer, and a man practically acquainted with the condition and action of political parties, addresses himself to the exposition of the objects, aims, and tendencies of the great anti-constitutional party. Mr. Masheder indulges in no vain rhetoric, but leads us by the hand through the dubious mazes of Democratic and Dissenting craft, and shows us by the unerring light of history to what goal we are tending, if we do not recognise and combat the tactics of those enemies of our State and Church who, in the name of liberty, aim at subverting alike our religious, civil, and personal freedom. We beg to recommend Mr. Masheder's work to the attention of Churchmen of every shade of opinion. The book is well written in nervous English, and there is a fulness of detail in it which marks at once the well-read political controversialist."—*Leicester Guardian.*

66, *Brook Street, London, W.*

December, 1864.



Messrs. Saunders, Otley, & Co.'s

LIST OF NEW BOOKS AND
NEW EDITIONS.

In 1 vol. post 8vo, 5s.

The Davenport Brothers :

A BIOGRAPHY OF IRA ERASTUS DAVENPORT AND
WILLIAM HENRY DAVENPORT, commonly known
as the "BROTHERS DAVENPORT."

With an Account of Eleven Years of Preternatural Phenomena and Extraordinary Physical and Psychical Manifestations.

By T. L. NICHOLS, M.D.,
Author of "Forty Years in America," &c. [Ready.]

In 1 vol. small 8vo.

Life's Paths.

A TALE OF OUR OWN DAY.

By the Author of "Gentle Influence," "Amy's Trials," &c.
With Frontispiece. [Just Ready.]

In 1 vol. post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Tales at the Outspan;

Or, Adventures in the Wild Regions of Southern Africa.

By CAPTAIN A. W. DRAYSON,
Author of "Sporting Scenes in South Africa, &c.

New and Cheaper Edition,
Illustrated with numerous Woodcuts. [Ready

In 3 vols. post 8vo.

Macaria.

A NOVEL

By AUGUSTA J. EVANS,
Author of "Beulah," &c. [Ready

In 1 vol. post 8vo, bevelled edges, 6s.

Arno's Waters;

AND OTHER POEMS.

By FRANCES JANE FORSAYTH. [Ready.

In 2 vols. post 8vo.

Uncle Angus.

A NOVEL

By MARY S. G. NICHOLS.
Author of "Uncle John," "Agnes Morris," &c. [Ready.

In 3 vols. post 8vo.

The Little House by the Railway Arch.

A NOVEL

By CHARLES FELIX,
Author of "Velvet Lawn," &c. [In preparation.

In 3 vols. post 8vo.

Percy Talbot.

A NOVEL

By GEORGE GRAHAM,
Author of "Carstone Rectory," &c. [Ready.

THE "ALABAMA."

Now ready, in 2 vols. post 8vo, Second Edition, 24s.

The Cruise of the "Alabama" and the "Sumter."

From the PRIVATE JOURNALS, &c., of CAPTAIN SEMMES
C.S.N., AND OTHER OFFICERS.

With ILLUSTRATIONS, CORRESPONDENCE, &c.
Second Edition.

"They are useful less for the novelty of the information which they convey than for authenticating, summarizing, and methodizing numerous little histories that have long since been notorious."—*Times*.

"The conduct and courage of Captain Semmes in action were worthy of his cause and of his reputation, but the qualities by which he will be hereafter memorable will rather be the judgment with which he executed his plans. Whether that peace for which Captain Semmes sighed during the lonely hours of his cruise comes soon or late, this at least is certain, that the flag under which the "Alabama" cruised has contributed a memorable episode to the naval history of the world."—*Saturday Review*.

"A simple, straightforward, and most interesting narrative of a successful enterprise, which must always hold a prominent place in the annals of naval warfare."—*Press*.

"Captain Semmes' Journals will do much not only to keep alive the fame of the Alabama in our national records, but to enable English men to appreciate the character of her daring commander as a

true gentleman and patriot, as well as a skilful and dashing sailor. The tale of the gallant "Alabama" will not easily be forgotten in the memory of Englishmen."—*John Bull*.

"We regard the volumes before us, authentic as they may be deemed in the source, as a very useful record of a very memorable episode in naval warfare."—*Globe*.

"An authentic account of the career of Captain Semmes—at least so far as it has been connected with the "Alabama" and "Sumter,"—compiled from his private journals and other papers, cannot fail to be read with interest both by friend and foe."—*Dispatch*.

"The name of Captain Semmes has gone forth into all lands wherever printed news can penetrate or the trumpet-tongue of fame is heard. Henceforth the name of Semmes is historic, and "290" is a charmed number."—*Illustrated London News*.

"These volumes will be read with great interest. Written in a frank, manly, unaffected style."—*London Review*.

In 3 vols. post 8vo.

Marion.

A NOVEL. By the late "MANHATTAN." [Ready.

"Manhattan's novel will be read because of the author's name. It is a pity that such a novel cannot be abridged or read by deputy. It is only a very faint idea of the life which is displayed in it that can be obtained from a partial reading of it."—*Times*.

"There is not the smallest sign of book-making apparent in all the pages, which contain material enough for half-a-dozen ordinary works of fiction, in which the

usual elaboration would be brought to bear."—*Reader*.

"The personages in "Marion" are supposed to circulate among, and to form part of the best New York society of the day. They are units in what we have been accustomed to hear described as the Upper Ten Thousand."—*Saturday Review*.

"Marion is a romance of no common order of excellence. No one who takes up the book will, if he can help it, put it down unfinished."—*Herald*.

In post 8vo.

My Sister's Son.

A NOVEL.

By W. J. SORRELL,

Author of "Christmas Day," "The Caricature," &c.

[In preparation.

In 1 vol. 8vo. 18s.

The History of the Cotton Famine, FROM THE FALL OF SUMTER TO THE PASSING OF THE PUBLIC WORKS ACT.

By R. ARTHUR ARNOLD.

[Ready.

"Mr. Arnold's 600 pages are filled with facts and figures arranged in a lucid popular style, and from the great and permanent importance of the subject will be read with interest."—*Times*.

"The story of the cotton famine, as told by Mr. Arnold, has all the interest of a romance; the statistics, the figures, the reports of Mr. Farnall, the weekly returns of the Board of Guardians, are all so many threads of interest in the story. The book is well put together, carefully, and with a fairness and candour which entitle the author to high praise."—*Athenæum*.

"It traces in a clear and succinct manner the steps which were taken to meet a national calamity, as soon as the prospects of the cotton supply became darkened."—*Observer*.

"Mr. Arnold has put together all the facts with lucid minuteness, and enabled

his readers to recall all the details of a struggle which reflected honour on British administration."—*Spectator*.

"We acknowledge the substantial merits of Mr. Arnold's work. He discusses with fairness, with temper, and we think with substantial justice, the various question which arose and became matter of controversy during the famine."—*London Review*.

"We congratulate Mr. Arnold on his having added a very valuable contribution to contemporary history. He has evidently bestowed very considerable pains in the collection of his facts, and arranged them in lucid order. His narrative has the merit of fidelity and of being free from partiality. It is complete in statement, and will always remain a standard book of reference with regard to the highly interesting events which it records."—*Herald*.

In 1 vol. post 8vo, Second Edition, 6s.

The Danes in Camp :

LETTERS FROM SÖNDERBÖRG.

By the Honourable AUBERON HERBERT.

[Ready.

"This is a pleasantly written book, because it is exactly what it professes to be. Mr. Herbert's book is satisfactory to read, because it presents so strange a contrast to the average of the literary class to which he belongs. Its merit is that it is written because its author wishes to tell what he has seen and felt, and not because he wishes to produce an article that will sell. There are many lively and striking passages."—*Saturday Review*.

"The letters are well and gracefully written; they teem with interesting incidents and narrations; there is about them an air of probity, which instantly impresses the reader with the conviction that they contain only the truth; and all this is mingled with a good humour and moderation that win our confidence and deserve our respect."—*Daily News*.

"Mr. Herbert is an agreeable, manly writer, and English readers will respond gratefully to the generous sympathy and admiration which he expresses for the inhabitants of the little kingdom."—*Athenæum*.

"These interesting letters are dedicated to the writer's mother, the Countess Dowager of Carnarvon. They place the events of the siege graphically before the reader, in simple but forcible language. All that Mr. Herbert says claims our most careful attention."—*Reader*.

"The story in his pages is an interesting one."—*Spectator, first notice*.

"The writer has many good qualities for his task. He writes easily and pleasantly, he is never prolix, he is not pedantic, and he is not facetious. The pictures are vivid, and the sentiments come fresh from their being unmixed with further matter."—*Spectator, second notice*.

"The book is in all respects charming. It is, moreover, a remarkably successful debut in literature. Indeed, it is the best book of the kind we ever met with. In every page we feel the presence of a gallant, meditative, and highly attractive nature. The book seems the prelude of a brilliant career."—*Press*.

In 1 vol. post 8vo. 2s.

Conyers Lea,

OR SKETCHES OF CHARACTER, MILITARY, MAGISTERIAL, AND EPISCOPAL.

By CYRIL THORNTON, M.A.

Cheap Edition.

[Ready.

In 3 vols. post 8vo.

Velvet Lawn.

A NOVEL.

By CHARLES FELIX, Author of "The Notting Hill Mystery."

[Ready.

"Strong and pervading interest there unquestionably is in the story."—*Observer*.

"A straightforward and workmanlike story, fairly interesting throughout. Mr. Felix is evidently a man of ability."—*Reader*.

"Such as admire an elaborately contrived plot, detailed in a fluent and easy style, will derive much pleasure from the perusal of the tale."—*Dispatch*.

"In character as well as incident, 'Velvet Lawn' is singularly rich, and it will unquestionably be a very popular novel."—*Press*.

"The plot appears to us to be original, and is certainly remarkable for its ingenuity."—*Athenæum*.

"The plot of 'Velvet Lawn' is exceedingly well conceived, and the interest never flags."—*Index*.

"It will find many readers, having attractions for the more thoughtful as well as the mere devourers of sensationalism."—*Herald*.

"There is a story, and that story is well told, so that it will command many readers."—*Globe*.

"It rises far above the ordinary run of novels."—*Daily News*.

In 3 vols. post 8vo.

Rington Priory.

A NOVEL. By ETHEL HONE.

[Ready.

"The moral is unobjectionable."—*Athenæum*.

"A very excellent novel of its class. Written with a natural force which suggests very little effort, it is free from affectation or strained effects. Novel readers will certainly thank Ethel Hone for this effort in their behalf."—*Reader*.

"Reminds us of 'Emma', and 'Sense and Sensibility,' 'Pride and Prejudice,' and the rest of that mildly brilliant constellation. 'Rington Priory' describes English people of various ranks in a country neighbourhood, and describes them well."—*Globe*.

"'Rington Priory' is an interesting story, with an air of truthfulness. The authoress is felicitous in her description of the village of Rington, with its various sets and cliques, its 'dissenting interest,' its trivial quarrels, and jealousies. The book is pleasantly written."—*Press*.

"The incidents, conversations, and plot are eminently natural and interesting; and the entire tone of the novel so perfectly healthy, that we consider it a positive relief from the morbid works with which the modern press so almost uniformly teems."—*Star*.

In 2 vols. post 8vo.

Mr. Christopher Katydid (of Casconia).

A TALE.

Edited by MARK HEYWOOD.

[Ready.

"There are marks of cleverness in this tale. The author gives evidence of ability."—*Athenæum*.

"The reader may derive much entertainment from a series of clever sketches relating to persons, customs, and scenery, partly American, partly English."—*Observer*.

"Quaint in construction and singular in manner, may be taken as a true definition of this American story; the plot is amusing."—*Bell's Messenger*.

"There are some pleasant descriptions of country scenery, and the story is very amusing."—*Star*.

"Reveals to us some new and curious habits of life."—*Daily News*.

"The work has merits, and is not underserving of perusal. It is a thoroughly trans-Atlantic tale, and the heroes and heroines whom it describes are refreshingly different from those of our native romance."—*London Review*.

In 1 vol. post 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Dissent and Democracy, THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS AND COMMON OBJECT. AN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

By RICHARD MASHEDER, B.A.;

Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge; and of the Inner Temple.
[Ready.]

"Mr. Masheder is a scholar; his quotations are always apposite and seldom hackneyed. He writes a little too flowingly, perhaps, but in a pleasant style, and he always keeps to the point; moreover, he has the merit of having massed his facts very ably, and put his case with singular clearness."—*Saturday Review*.

"No one can arise from a perusal of Mr. Masheder's book without admiring his earnestness in the cause of Church and State."—*John Bull*.

"We thank the author of this important volume, and we hope it will be read, both for its correct historical exhibition of Dissent; and also for its counsels to Churchmen in the presence of a vigilant foe."—*Clerical Journal*.

"We can recommend it most heartily to our readers. It is one of the ablest modern productions. Its author is completely master of his subject, from his own standpoint; he has done a service for which we unfeignedly thank him."—*Church Times*.

"Mr. Masheder's book is full of valuable information, and bristles with cogent inference; and we strongly recommend it to all those who are concerned about the political fortunes of the Church."—*Church Review*.

"It is impossible to overrate the importance of the topics which form the subject matter of the present volume. Extremely well worth reading, and replete with good sense."—*Press*.

In 1 large vol. 8vo, price 21s.

Australian Explorations.

JOHN McDOUALL STUART'S JOURNALS OF EXPLO-
RATIONS IN AUSTRALIA from 1858 to 1862.

Edited by WILLIAM HARDMAN, M.A., F.R.G.S., &c.

Illustrated with a Portrait of the author, and 12 page Engravings
on Wood, drawn by George French Angas, from Sketches
taken during the Expedition, and accompanied by a
carefully-prepared Map of the Explorer's Route across
the entire Continent. [Ready.]

"A very large and valuable addition to our geographical knowledge of Australia."—*Observer*.

"Worthy of being ranked amongst the most important in the History of Australian discovery."—*Morning Advertiser*.

"To dilate on the value of the work to the very large number who are directly or indirectly interested in Australian progress is superfluous."—*Dispatch*.

"It is impossible to refrain from the strongest admiration of the narrative, given in his own Journal, in which so much unpretending unconscious heroism is evinced, such simple devotion to the end of his enterprise; thankfulness, not self-laudation at its accomplishment, hold-

ing his life so lightly so that his duty might be done."—*Globe*.

"These Journals abound in interesting information, and have a special charm as living records of what the discoverer has seen and done."—*Examiner*.

"We can commend the book to the careful perusal of those who wish to appreciate something of the future of Australia."—*Morning Star*.

"The conductor of the expedition has earned lasting fame for the sterling qualities which he proved himself to possess. Throughout the toilsome journeys, of which he has given a minute and graphic account, he evinced every qualification which should characterise the leader such expeditions."—*Morning Post*.

1 Vol. Foolscap 8vo, 5s.

A Piece of Bread.

From the French of M. Jean Macé.

By Mrs. ALFRED GATTY.

Author of "Parables from Nature," "Legendary Tales," &c.

[Ready.

"Mrs. Gatty has here favoured the public with a volume weighty in its matter, fascinating in its form, and in its moral and religious tone above all praise."—*London Review*.

"This work, especially intended for the use of the young, explains in a manner both intelligible and interesting, 'the history of life as sustained and supported in the human race.'"—*Dispatch*.

"Written in a reverent spirit deserving of commendation—a fact that the name of the translator alone would guarantee."—*John Bull*.

"To Mrs. Gatty great praise is due. * * * The translation seems excellent. A charming little book."—*Church Review*.

"Let us commend this pleasant little book to parents and guardians throughout

the length and breadth of the British dominions, since it is one of the very best of its class that we have met with."—*Bell's Messenger*.

"It exhibits the honest pains, the desire to please, the unmistakable labour, which characterise all Mrs. Gatty undertakes for the acceptance of the public."—*Press*.

"This little book has reached its eighth edition on the other side of the Channel, having been adopted by the University Commission of Paris among their prize books."—*Athenæum*.

"Written for children, grown up people will read it with profit and pleasure. Eight editions have made the French public familiar with the original, and Mrs. Gatty has conferred no slight boon on the English by a translation which faithfully preserves its best features."—*Spectator*.

Also,

PART 'II.

Completing the Work.

[Just ready.

Vol. II.

The Marquess of Dalhousie's Administration of British India.

By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A., of University College, Oxford.

[In the press.

The Kennel Stud Book.

Edited by "CECIL."

[In preparation.

In 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

Shakspeare Weighed in an Even Balance.

By the Rev. ALFRED POWNALL, M.A.

Vicar of Trowse Newton and Fakenham, late Crosse's Theological Scholar, Cambridge, &c.

[Ready

In 1 vol. 8vo, 12s.

A Theodicy; or, Vindication of the DIVINE GLORY as MANIFESTED in the CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE MORAL WORLD. By ALBERT TAYLOR BLEDSE, LL.D., Professor of Mathematics in the University of Virginia. Dedicated to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

"Considering the importance of the subject, the book is reasonably concise, and the style and literary execution generally are creditable to the learned author. It is more readable and more easily understood than such treatises usually are."—*Spectator*.

"Dr. Bledsoe's work has the pre-eminent merit of being mainly true."—*Literary Churchman*.

"In these times of desultory reading, a work like this will brace up the mental powers, and be suggestive of many noble thoughts, and we recommend it with much

confidence to the clergy at large."—*Clerical Journal*.

"An able, ingenious, and learned volume."—*Edinburgh Courant*.

"The volume deserves the serious attention of the theologian."—*Press*.

"We can recommend this volume to our readers with the assurance that they will derive much benefit from following the author through the various steps of his argument."—*Scottish Guardian*.

"None can question the fairness of his statements or the general cogency of his reasoning."—*Morning Post*.

[Ready.

1 vol. post 8vo, illustrated, 12s.

Hunting Tours.

By "CECIL."

[Ready.

"The book is a contribution to the subject which has long been wanted, and which reflects the greatest credit upon the author for his composition, and the publishers for their discrimination in bringing it before the public in its present attractive form."—*Sporting Gazette*.

"'Hunting Tours' will afford interest and amusement to all classes of readers. The work is admirably illustrated by E. Corbet, and beautifully got up both as to type and binding."—*Sporting Review*.

"There is scarcely any topic connected with the hunting field which is not treated with fulness and force, in 'Cecil's' picturesque and animated sketches."—*Morning Post*.

"'Cecil' has performed the task he undertook with ability and zeal, and his 'Hunting Tours' should be found on the library table of every sporting man."—*Sun*.

"A volume which cannot fail to prove of much interest to sportsmen, and we commend it to their especial attention."—*Oxford Journal*.

"Contains an immense amount of valuable information, such as only a veteran fox hunter of the first order could supply. 'Cecil's' pseudonym suffices to guarantee the excellence of his book."—*Press*.

"Written with a masterly knowledge of its subject * * * 'Cecil' writes like a gentleman: there is much that is very exciting and interesting in his book."—*Daily News*.

"Gives particulars respecting the various packs with which the author has hunted, narrates the fortunes of their several masters or whips, and chronicles here and there the particulars of a remarkably successful run."—*Sunday Times*.

1 vol. post 8vo.

Passages in the Life of an Old Maid.

[Ready.

"Certainly above the average."—*Morning Post*.

"Full of interest and detailed in a lively

natural style."—*Sun*.

"The style of writing is easy, and often amusing."—*Illustrated News*.

1 vol. post 8vo. 5s.

Why Paul Ferroll Killed his Wife.

By the Author of "PAUL FERROLL." Fourth Edition. [Ready,

1 vol. small 8vo, antique, 7s. 6d.

Sermons,

By the late Rev. C. T. ERSKINE, M.A.
Incumbent of St. Michael's, Wakefield. With a Memoir of his Life,
and a preface by the Bishop of Brechin. [Ready.

"The Sermons are far above the average of such compositions, and in many parts they are remarkable for the originality of thought which they possess. A devout and reverent spirit, moreover, pervades every sermon."—*Observer*.

"Mr. Erskine's Sermons are thirty-one in number, and they are all interesting."—*Clerical Journal*.

"A work of absorbing interest, and one which none can well read without feeling infinitely the better for it. The volume is got up with singular neatness."—*Church Review*.

"Mr. Erskine's style is vigorous and thoughtful."—*Literary Churchman*.

"These Sermons will be treasured by many, and pondered over by many, who knew the sterling excellence of him by whom they were written and preached. The memoir of his life has evidently been a labour of love, and affectionately depicts a character which no one can study without deriving benefit from it."—*Scottish Guardian*.

"The fervour, simplicity, and faith evinced in these discourses are worthy of the best age."—*Globe*.

"Of Mr. Erskine's Sermons we can hardly speak in too high terms. Calm, thoughtful, mild, and yet austere, they are instinct with Catholic truth and Catholic faith."—*Churchman*.

Second and revised edition, post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The Gouty Philosopher;

Or, THE OPINIONS, WHIMS, AND ECCENTRICITIES
OF JOHN WAGSTAFFE, ESQ., OF WILBYE GRANGE.

By CHARLES MACKAY. [Ready.

Vol. III. 8vo, completing the work, 21s.

The History of the Church of England,

From the DEATH OF ELIZABETH to the PRESENT TIME.

By the Rev. GEORGE G. PERRY, M.A.

Rector of Waddington, late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College.
Oxford. [Ready.

"Written in an easy style, and in a moderate, sensible spirit. Mr. Perry is, apparently, a good Churchman, belonging to no party, and desirous of doing justice to Nonconformists as well as to opposing schools in the Church."—*Reader*.

"A most useful and ably written work. The spirit in which the whole question of Church history is treated is highly creditable to the author, and throughout exhibits liberal, enlightened, and tolerant views."—*Observer*.

"The whole makes a pleasant and readable history of the period chronicled. Mr. Perry manifests a desire to maintain

the sound doctrine and discipline of the Church."—*English Churchman*.

"Our author never shirks any portion of work which fairly belongs to him; and above all, he has no bias but for the broad plain truth. Mr. Perry's work must take its place as the companion of Southey and Short, not only in the Library of every theological student, but every reader of history."—*Herald*.

"This valuable and important work is now complete, and Mr. Perry has the honour of filling up what has long been wanting in our ecclesiastical literature."—*Clerical Journal*.

In 8vo. price 10s. 6d., Second Edition.

The Cotton Trade:

its Bearing upon the Prosperity of Great Britain and Commerce
of the American Republics considered in Connection with the
System of Negro Slavery in the Confederate States.

By GEORGE MCHENRY.

"Contains a mass of information on most matters at all involved in the origin of the disruption among the whilom United States."—*Glasgow Courier*. [Ready.

Second edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

The Life & Times of Sir James Graham, Bart.

By W. T. M. TORRENS, late M.P.

Author of "Industrial History of Free Nations." [Ready.

"This is a masterly piece of political biography."—*Enquirer*.

"This work is well-written, and presents an interesting picture of the struggles, the failures, and long delayed successes of a rising politician."—*Times*.

"Sir J. Graham has been most fortunate in his biographer, who has raised our opinion of him by his able memoir, . . . fair, temperate, and impartial, written in the best taste."—*Globe*.

THE BROWN BOOK :

(FOR 1865)

A Book of Ready Reference, for the Use of London
Visitors and Residents in London,

CONTAINING
EVERY KIND OF LOCAL INFORMATION.

Published Annually, Price One Shilling.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

ARNOLD—THE MARQUESS OF DALHOUSIE'S ADMINISTRATION OF BRITISH INDIA. By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A., late Principal of Poona College, and Fellow of the University of Bombay. Vol. I., containing the Acquisition and Administration of the Punjab. 8vo, 15s.

BAILEY—THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF THE GREAT POWERS. By PHILIP JAMES BAILEY, Author of "Festus." 1 vol., fcp. 8vo, 6s.

BROMLEY—A WOMAN'S WANDERINGS IN THE WESTERN WORLD. A Series of Letters addressed to Sir Fitzroy Kelly, M.P. By his Daughter, Mrs. BROMLEY. 1 vol., post 8vo, with Illustrations, 10s. 6d.

CASWALL—THE AMERICAN CHURCH AND THE AMERICAN UNION. By HENRY CASWALL, D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

DENISON—CHURCH RATE A NATIONAL TRUST. By GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, M.A., Vicar of East Brent, and Archdeacon of Taunton. Cheap edition, 1 vol., 8vo, 5s.

— **REMARKS ON ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.** By Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., F.R.S., F.A.S., Colonel Royal Engineers. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

DRAYSON—TALES AT THE OUTSPAN;

Or, Adventures in the Wild Regions of Southern Africa. By Captain A. W. DRAYSON, Author of "Sporting Scenes in South Africa," &c., 1 vol., post 8vo, new and cheaper edition, 7s. 6d.

DREXELIUS—THE HELIOTROPIUM;

Or, Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine. Translated from the Latin of Jeremy Drexelius. By the Rev. REGINALD SHUTE, Author of the Life of "The Rev. Henry Newland." With a Preface by the Bishop of Brechin, and with a Frontispiece and five Illustrations, after designs by Alfred Bell, Esq. 8vo, 21s.

FAITH AND PEACE,

Being Answers to Essays and Reviews. By Several Writers, with a Preface by the Venerable Archdeacon Denison. 1 vol., 8vo, 12s.

FONBLANQUE—NIPHON AND PE-CHE-LI;

Or, Two Years in Japan and Northern China. By EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FONBLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 1 vol. 8vo. with Illustrations, 21s.

FULLOM—HISTORY OF WILLIAM SHAKE-

SPEARE, Player and Poet, with New Facts and Traditions. By S. W. FULLOM, author of "The Great Highway," &c. 1 vol., 8vo, Second Edition, 7s. 6d.

HANDBOOK OF TURNING,

Containing Instructions in Concentric, Elliptic, and Eccentric Turning; also various Plates of Chucks, Tools, &c., and a Portrait of the author done in the Lathe. A New Edition, fcp. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

GODKIN—EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

Its History, Institutions, Systems, Statistics, and Progress, from the Earliest Times to the Present. By JAMES GODKIN. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

HARTLEY—A HANDY BOOK FOR RIFLE

VOLUNTEERS; or, a Compendium of Instruction for Drill and the Rifle, according to the most Recent Regulations. Arranged systematically and specially adapted to the Progressive Improvement of the Volunteer in Every Stage. By Captain W. G. HARTLEY. 1 vol., fcap. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

HORSE-RACING:

Its History, and other Records of the Principal and other Race Meetings. With Anecdotes, &c. 8vo, 12s.

HUGHES—BIBLIOLATRY, AN ESSAY.

By the Rev. JAMES HUGHES, M.A. 1 vol., fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

JOYCE—ECCLESIA VINDICATA,

A Treatise on Appeals in Matters Spiritual. By JAMES MAYLAND JOYCE, M.A., author of a "Constitutional History of the Convocation of the Clergy," &c. 1 vol., fcp. 8vo, 5s. 6d.

LANGUAGE OF FLOWERS,

With Illustrative Poetry; to which are now added the Calendar of Flowers, and the Dial of Flowers. Thirteenth edition, 1 vol., fcp. 8vo, with coloured Plates, 7s.

LAURIE—NORTHERN EUROPE

(Denmark, Sweden, Russia), Local, Social, and Political. By Captain W. F. B. LAURIE, late Commissary of Ordnance, Nagpore Force. 1 vol., 8vo.

LEADERS of PUBLIC OPINION in IRELAND.

1 vol., fcp. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

LECTURES ON THE MOUNTAINS;

Or, the Highlands and Highlanders as they were and as they are. 2 vols., fcap. 8vo, 10s.

LEE—ON MIRACLES.

An Examination of the Remarks "On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity," in "Essays and Reviews." By WILLIAM LEE, D.D. 1 vol., 8vo, 5s.

LIFE AMONGST THE COLLIERIES.

1 vol., post 8vo, 5s.

MACKAY—THE GOUTY PHILOSOPHER;

Or, the Opinions, Whims, and Eccentricities of John Wagstaffe, Esq., of Wilbye Grange. By CHAS. MACKAY. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

MELENA—CALABRIA AND THE LIPARIAN ISLANDS IN THE YEAR 1860.

By ELPIS MELENA. 1 vol., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

NEWSPAPER PRESS of the PRESENT DAY,

Its Birth and Growth throughout the United Kingdom. 1s. 6d.

NEALE—ESSAYS ON LITURGOLOGY AND

CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. 1 vol., 8vo, 18s.

NORTHCOTE—TWENTY YEARS OF FI-

NANCIAL POLICY. A Summary of the Chief Financial Measures passed between 1842 and 1861, with a Table of Budgets. By Sir STAFFORD H. NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P., 1 vol., 8vo, 14s.

ONGARA—BARON RICASOLI,

Prime Minister of Italy. A Biography. From the Italian of F. DALL' ONGARA. 1 vol., fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF

THE LORD'S SUPPER; or, Holy Communion. With short Notes and Devotions. 1s.

OZANNE—THE SOUTH AS IT IS;

Or, Twenty-One Years' Experience in the Southern States of America. By the Rev. T. D. OZANNE, M.A. 1 vol., post 8vo, 8s.

PERRY—THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

OF ENGLAND FROM THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH TO THE PRESENT TIME. By the Rev. G. G. PERRY, M.A. In 3 vols., 8vo, price 21s. each.

RECOLLECTIONS of GENERAL GARIBALDI;

Or, Travels from Rome to Lucerne, comprising a Visit to the Mediterranean, Isles of La Maddelena and Caprera, and General Garibaldi's Home. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

RELIGIOUS TENDENCIES OF THE AGE.

1 vol. fcp. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

ROBERTS—AN AUTUMN TOUR IN SPAIN, IN THE YEAR 1859. By the Rev. RICHARD ROBERTS, B.A. 1 vol., 8vo, with Illustrations, 21s.

SCHERZER—NARRATIVE OF THE CIRCUMNAVIGATION OF THE GLOBE by the Austrian Frigate Novara, undertaken by order of the Imperial Government, in the Years 1857, 1858, and 1859. By Dr. KARL SCHERZER, Author of "Travels in Central America," &c., containing an hitherto unpublished letter of Humboldt. With numerous Wood Engravings, 3 vols., royal 8vo. £4 10s.

SHUTTE—LIFE, TIMES, AND WRITINGS OF THE RIGHT REV. DR. HENRY PHILPOTTS, Lord Bishop of Exeter. By the Rev. R. N. SHUTTE, B.A., Author of the "Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." Vol. 1, 8vo, with Portrait, 15s.

STEPHEN—ADVENTURES OF A GENTLEMAN IN SEARCH OF A HORSE. By Sir GEORGE STEPHEN, with Illustrations by George Cruikshank. New and Cheaper Edition. 1 vol., post 8vo, 5s.

TORRENS—THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE RIGHT HON. SIR JAMES R. G. GRAHAM, Bart., G.C.B., M.P. By TORRENS McCULLAGH TORRENS, late M.P., Author of the "Life of Sheil," &c. 2 vols., 8vo, price 16s. each.

TRAVELS IN LADAK, TARTARY, AND KASHMIR. By Lieut.-Col. TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusileers. Second Edition, 1 vol., 8vo, beautifully illustrated. 28s.

VERNEY—THE SHANNON'S BRIGADE IN INDIA. Being some account of Sir William Peel's Naval Brigade in the Indian Campaign of 1857—1858. By EDMUND HOPE VERNEY, Lieut., R.N. 1 vol., large 8vo, 7s. 6d.

WATSON—THE LIFE OF GEORGE FOX, the Founder of the Quakers. Fully and impartially related on the authority of his own Journals and Letters, and the historians of his own sect. By the Rev. JOHN SELBY WATSON, M.A., F.R.L.S., Author of the "Life of Porson." 1 vol., post. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

SIR WILLIAM WALLACE, THE SCOTTISH HERO. A Narrative of his Life and Actions. By the Rev. JOHN SELBY WATSON, M.A., F.R.S.L. 1 vol., post 8vo., 10s. 6d.

WOLFF—TRAVELS AND ADVENTURES OF THE REV. JOSEPH WOLFF, late Missionary to the Jews and Mahomedans in Persia, Bokhara, Cashmere, &c. Cheaper Edition. 1 vol., 8vo, 12s.

WOODGATE—SERMONS ON THE SUNDRY HISTORICAL LESSONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT Throughout the Year. By H. A. WOODGATE, B.D. 2 vols., 15s.

*FICTION.***ANSELMO.**

A Tale of Modern Italy. 2 vols., post 8vo, 21s.

ASHCOMBE CHURCHYARD.

By EVELYN BENSON. Cheap Edition. 2 vols., post 8vo, 12s.

CHARLEY NUGENT;

Or, Passages in the Life of a Sub. 3 vols., post 8vo, 31s. 6d.

CHRYSALE;

Or, a Story with an End. By FRANCIS FREELING BRODERIP.
Illustrated by Thomas Hood. 1 vol., 5s. 6d.

CLINTON MAYNYARD.

A Tale of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

CONSTANCE MORDAUNT;

Or, Life in the Western Archipelago. 2 vols., post 8vo, 21s.

CURATE OF CRANSTON, with other TALES

in Prose and Verse. By CUTHBERT BEDE. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

DREAM OF A LIFE.

By Lady SCOTT. 3 vols., post 8vo, 31s. 6d.

FIELD OF LIFE;

Or, Sowing and Reaping. Second Edition. 3 vols., post 8vo, 31s. 6d.

GARDEN FABLES;

Or, Flowers of Speech. By Mrs. MEDHURST. Illustrated by Thomas Hood. 7s. 6d.

GERTRUDE MELTON;

Or, Nature's Nobleman. 1 vol., post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

GREAT CATCHES;

Or, Grand Matches. 2 vols., post 8vo, 21s.

GREAT MISTAKE.

By the Author of "Palgrave of Sycamora." 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

HAROLD OVERDON, ASHORE & AFLOAT.

By CHARTLEY CASTLE, Author of "John Woodburn." 1 vol. post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

HISTORY OF THE GRANDEUR AND

DOWNFALL OF CÆSAR BIROTEAU. By M. de BALZAC
Translated by JOHN HAWKINS SIMPSON. 1 vol., 7s.

LEILA MARSTON.

A Tale. By SYDNEY ELLIS. 1 vol. post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

LIGHTHOUSE, THE.

A Naval Novel. By ELIZABETH HARCOURT MITCHELL,
2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

LOSING AND WINNING ;

Or, Richer and Poorer. A Tale, founded on Fact. By the Author of "The Lighthouse." 2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

M.P. (AN) IN SEARCH OF A CREED.

By the Author of "Squires and Parsons." 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

MY ELDEST BROTHER.

A Tale. By the Author of "Our Farm of Four Acres." 2 vols., 8vo, 21s.

NORTHUMBRIAN ABBOTS.

A Tale of the Seventh Century. By R. B. WERBORTON. 1 vol., fcp. 8vo, 5s.

OUR NEW RECTOR ;

Or, the Village of Norton. Edited by CUTHBERT BEDE, Author of "Mr. Verdant Green." 1 vol., post 8vo.

OLD, OLD STORY—LOVE.

By BERKELEY AIKIN, Author of "Anne Sherwood." 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

OLD ROMAN WELL.

A Romance of Dark Streets and Green Lanes. 2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

RECOLLECTIONS of a COUNTRY CLERGY-

MAN. 1 vol., post 8vo, 5s.

SEPHAS ;

Or, Cloudy Skies. A Story. By MICHAEL FORD. 2 vols., post 8vo, 21s.

SKELETON IN THE CUPBOARD.

By LADY SCOTT. Cheap Edition. Post 8vo, 5s.

STAR OF LOVELL.

A Tale of the Poor Clergy. By the Rev. JAMES BANDINEL, M.A. 3 vols.

VICAR OF LYSEL.

A Clergyman's Diary of 1729—82. Small 8vo, 4s. 6d.

WAITING FOR THE VERDICT.

An Autobiography. By BERKELEY AIKIN, Author of "Anne Sherwood," &c. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

WEIRD OF THE WENTWORTHS.

A Tale of the Time of George IV. By JOHANNES SCOTUS. 2 vols., post 8vo, 21s.

WHISPERING VOICES OF THE YULE.

Fcp. 8vo, 5s. 6d.

WHY PAUL FERROLL KILLED HIS WIFE.

By the Author of "Paul Ferroll." 4th Edition, 1 vol., post 8vo, 5s.

WILLIE ATHERTON.

A Tale. By GEORGE HERBERT. 1 vol., post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

WOMAN'S LIFE.

By Mrs. BRISCOE, Author of "The Young Bride." 2 vols., post 8vo, 21s.

POETRY.

C'EST VRAI:

An Idyll of the East:

DAUGHTERS OF KING DAHER,

And other Poems. By THOMAS HOOD. 1 vol., fcp. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

IN MEMORIAM.

By the Author of "England and Australia."

EARL GODWIN'S FEAST,

And other Poems. By STEWART LOCKYER, Author of "St. Bartholomew's Day." 4s.

FRIENDSHIP,

And other Poems. By HIBERNICUS. 5s.

ITALIAN LYRICS,

And other Poems. 3s.

JUDITH,

And other Poems. By FRANCIS MILLS, M.R.C.S.L. 5s.

MATILDA OF NORMANDY,

A Poetical Tribute to the Imperial Academy of Caen. By H. M. CAREY. 2s.

NUPTIALS OF BARCELONA,

A Tale of Priestly Frailty and Spanish Tyranny.

POEMS.

By the Author of "Paul Ferroll." Including a New Edition of IX Poems by V. 1 vol., fcp. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

PARISH HYMN BOOK.

Edited by the Rev. H. W. Beadon, the Rev. Greville Phillimore, and the Rev. James Russell Woodford. Price 8d. and 1s.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE PAST. 3s. 6d.

SACRED POEMS.

By the late Right Hon. Sir ROBERT GRANT, a New Edition, with a Notice by Lord Glenelg. 5s.

SATAN RESTORED.

By W. CYPLES. 6s.

SHADOW OF THE YEW.

By NORMAN B. YONGE.

STILL SMALL VOICE.

A Poem in Four Cantos. By NORMAN B. YONGE. 6s. 6d.

SUMMER SONGS.

By MORTIMER COLLINS. 3s. 6d.

ONE SHILLING.

THE BROWN BOOK

FOR 1865.



OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

EXTRACTS FROM

THE MORNING POST.
 THE MORNING HERALD.
 THE STANDARD.
 THE SUN.
 THE READER.
 NOTES AND QUERIES.
 THE NEWS.
 THE BUILDER.
 THE SOCIETY OF ARTS.
 THE LANCET.
 THE WEEKLY REVIEW.
 THE CITY PRESS.
 THE ENGLISH CHURCHMAN.
 THE LAW TIMES.
 THE WESLEYAN TIMES.
 THE ILLUSTRATED TIMES.
 THE COURT JOURNAL.
 THE MARYLEBONE MERCURY.
 THE CLERKENWELL NEWS.
 THE CLERKENWELL DIAL.
 THE SPORTING GAZETTE.

THE CHELTENHAM JOURNAL.
 THE GATESHEAD OBSERVER.
 THE RUGBY ADVERTISER.
 THE CARLISLE PATRIOT.
 THE STOCKPORT AND CHESHIRE
 COUNTY NEWS.
 THE WESTERN NEWS.
 THE COVENTRY HERALD.
 THE STOCKPORT ADVERTISER.
 THE BLACKBURN STANDARD.
 THE BRIGHTON GAZETTE.
 THE WITNESS.
 THE BRADFORD OBSERVER.
 THE NOTTINGHAM REVIEW.
 THE CAMBRIDGE CHRONICLE.
 THE POOLE AND SOUTH-WESTERN
 HERALD.
 THE WARWICK ADVERTISER.
 THE BERKSHIRE CHRONICLE.
 THE NEWCASTLE DAILY JOURNAL.
 THE TUNBRIDGE WELLS GAZETTE.

THE DUBLIN EVENING POST.
 &c., &c., &c.

LONDON: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
 66, BROOK STREET, W.

ONE SHILLING.

THE

B R O W N B O O K

FOR 1865.

A Book of Ready Reference

TO THE

LONDON HOTELS, LODGING & BOARDING HOUSES; BREAKFAST & DINING
ROOMS; METROPOLITAN RAILWAYS; PUBLIC & CIRCULATING
LIBRARIES; AMUSEMENTS; PICTURE GALLERIES; HOSPITALS,
SCHOOLS, & CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS; RELIGIOUS,
LEARNED, AND ARTISTIC SOCIETIES.

With full Information as to Situation, Specialty, &c., &c.

AND A

H A N D Y L I S T,

SHOWING THE NEAREST POST OFFICE, MONEY-ORDER OFFICE, CAB STAND,
POLICE, TELEGRAPH, AND COMMISSIONAIRE STATION, FIRE ENGINE
AND ESCAPE, HOSPITAL, &c.,

TO UPWARDS OF

ONE THOUSAND

OF THE

PRINCIPAL STREETS OF THE METROPOLIS.

PUBLISHED YEARLY.

LONDON:
SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, BROOK STREET, W.
1865.

MORNING HERALD.

The edition for 1865 of this most useful annual has just appeared. It contains a "Handy List" of the principal streets in the metropolis, with references to the nearest receiving-house, pillar-box, and money-order office, the station of the nearest commissionaire, telegraph, fire engine, fire escape, cab and police, as well as a direction to the nearest hospital. Besides these it has a list of boarding-houses and hotels, many with their prices stated. There is a capital general directory for those in search of lodgings, telling them where to find apartments, and the peculiar recommendations possessed by each district in and around London. A directory to restaurants where luncheon and dinner are provided will be of great value to the country visitor. The lists of religious, scientific, and artistic societies are very copious and well compiled, besides being a novel feature, and the directory of museums and picture collections tells in a few words what is to be seen by the visitor. We notice a decided improvement in the section devoted to "amusements, sights, &c.;" and strangers will find the short guide to the various metropolitan and suburban railways particularly useful.

STANDARD.

Considering that the price of "The Brown Book" is only a shilling, not only residents in London, but every visitor from the country, ought to possess it. Two minutes' study of it before setting out in the morning—or the merest reference to it in case of difficulty—will greatly facilitate the labours of the sight-seer; while Londoners will find it useful every day in the week.

THE SUN.

Everyone, excepting only those who are Green, ought to get "The Brown Book," a little Brown study, over the contents of which, as therein set down very plainly in Black and White, will be found, when read, to be a most effectual remedy for the Blue Devils. Within the compass of a goodly shilling pamphlet of some two hundred pages it presents to view a mass of really valuable, because useful, information in regard to all the Inns and Outs—that is, to all the Hotels and places of Public Amusement, scattered about the metropolis and its vicinity.

WESLEYAN TIMES.

The varied information seems to have been collected with very great care, and to be classified admirably. It is no mere scanty compilation, and extends to nearly 200 octavo pages, the price being merely nominal—one shilling.

THE NEWS.

Visitors to London had long felt the want of some guide or hand-book, not only to the various places of amusement, with a list of cab fares—which are the two most prominent objects to which our so-called guide books chiefly aspire—but some work that would give them a general idea of what was worth seeing, where to put up while in London, and generally how to avoid those little unpleasantnesses incident to strangers. This want "The Brown Book" is intended to supply. The subject of lodgings is well treated, though in the first issue we are told it was the cause of "much annoyance and vexation of spirit." Several good hints have been thrown out about situation, price, and climate in regard to taking lodgings.

MORNING POST.

Visitors to London will consult their convenience by arming themselves with "The Brown Book;" and dwellers within the sound of Bow bells will find it a valuable book of reference. There are few items of local information which it will not be found to contain; and so much attention has been bestowed to render the arrangement of the details at once simple and effective that, though they are necessarily multitudinous, no difficulty will be found in arriving at the desired intelligence. It is, amongst other things, a guide to the hotels, lodging and boarding houses of London; to the various railway termini, libraries, places of amusement, picture-galleries, schools, hospitals, religious, learned, and artistic societies; and gives full and explicit directions as to situation, and such short particulars as are likely to be useful to the inquirer. "The Brown Book" supplies a want which has long been felt, and its merits will no doubt be practically acknowledged.

THE CHELTENHAM JOURNAL.

This is a particularly cheap and useful handbook, containing a mass of instruction concerning those things on which visitors to the metropolis desire to be especially informed, the same being arranged in such a manner as to be easily referred to and made immediately available. In the present edition various imperfections which existed in last year's "Brown Book" have been amended, and several new features introduced. For instance, the information with regard to the subject of "lodgings" has been remodelled and rendered more serviceable than before, and lists of the "religious and artistic societies" of the metropolis have been added. Any stranger visiting London would do well to invest a shilling in the purchase of a copy of the "Brown Book" before setting out on a journey of discovery.

CHURCHMAN.

The bare enumeration of what is contained within these brown covers is a sufficient indication of its usefulness to the dweller in London or to visitors to the metropolis,—that is, to almost all the world.

THE RUGBY ADVERTISER.

The visitor to London could not possibly invest a shilling to better advantage than in procuring this admirable little work; indeed, the dweller in the metropolis, keen though he may be, will find on perusing its pages that there is a vast deal in the overgrown city of which he is not cognisant.

BRIGHTON GAZETTE.

This is a novel but very useful book of ready reference in all matters respecting the metropolis, concerning which "young men from the country," and, indeed, numbers of the inhabitants of "the modern Babylon" themselves, are very often very much at fault.

PUBLIC OPINION.

The Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co. have issued "The Brown Book for 1865." Besides the very useful information which the first volume contained, the present one has in addition Lists of the Religious and Artistic Societies, Guides to the Picture Collections of the Metropolis and the Metropolitan Railway System. The same admirable arrangements are preserved which rendered "The Brown Book for 1864" so valuable as an easy reference, and we are glad to see the projectors intend adding to the information year by year.

THE MORNING POST.

This "Brown Book" is a novel attempt to furnish useful information which is not contained in the comprehensive mass of red books, guides, and directories. It is a spirited undertaking, and ought to be encouraged. The daily increase not only in the extent of London itself, but in the resort of strangers to the growing centre of the world's mighty interests, requires additional facilities of access, as well to the minor conveniences as to the higher amenities of confederate civilization. Such is the purpose of this intended half-yearly publication. Its compendious title-page enumerates the objects which it embraces; and which it proposes to place within the reach of all who can be benefitted by them. It is very complete in its list of public offices, police stations, postal arrangements, and cab stands, of scientific societies, their constitutions and times of meeting for the next half-year, of libraries and museums, of theatres and other places of amusement, of hospitals and charitable institutions. On these points its copious statements may be serviceable alike to residents and visitors. But the department of hotels, lodging and boarding houses, and of breakfast and dining rooms, is as yet very imperfect—a mere skeleton without integuments—an outline framework which has yet to be filled up. The proprietors of these establishments were unwilling to give the particulars asked of them; they declined to advertise the rent of their rooms, or insert their names in a book of which the nature and object were unknown to them. In this branch of their labours the compilers of this work aimed at too much; the terms of lodgings are not fixable; they fluctuate with seasons of arrival and departure; they vary to permanent or casual inmates, to those who give trouble and to those who exact little attendance, to those who have a pendant of children, and to others who give frequent parties. Nor can the features of each dwelling be noticed; in many cases praise would be deceptive and truth libellous. For the purpose of "The Brown Book" it would be quite sufficient to state the general character of a street or square in which there are many lodgings, and the natures of its vicinity, with the numbers of these houses and the names of their keepers.* It would also be enough to say that in obscure localities the terms are low, in respectable situations moderate, but high in genteel and fashionable neighbourhoods. For a work constituted on this principle the editors would not fail to obtain all the information they want to satisfy the requirements of the public, and ensure an extensive patronage.

THE SUN.

Another ready reference book. Not a blue book. Not the Red Book. Not a *livre jaune*. Not party-coloured. But—a sensible, matter-of-fact, directly-to-the-purpose, plain, blunt, honest, sober *Brown Book*. A book to be published half-yearly—so that it will always convey the very latest information. A book that answers, among other frequently recurring questions, "Which is the nearest Post Office?" "How shall I find a Commissionaire?" "Whereabout is the nearest Telegraph Office?" A book so apropos that it ought to be placed so very handily for reference when required that the possessor should come at last to say of it as Charles

* This suggestion has been acted upon in the present issue, and it is hoped successfully. It will be easily understood that this department of "The Brown Book" is not merely difficult to carry out and of a most costly nature, but absolutely dependent on time and increasing confidence for its full development. With pains and patience, however, neither of which will be spared, the Editor hopes to make it with each successive issue more and more complete.

II. said of Rochester—"Never in the way, and never out of the way!" We don't know to whom it will prove the most acceptable—to the old Londoner, or to the young man from the country—to the true born Cockney, or to the unmistakable Foreigner. To every one who consults it, it will for a dead certainty prove most welcome, and all the more welcome because, we believe, perfectly reliable.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

A book containing the information detailed in this ample title-page cannot but be very useful, if the information be correct; and we are bound to state that, as far as we have been able to test it, "The Brown Book" is as correct, and consequently as useful, as any of its Red and Blue contemporaries.

THE NEWS.

This handy little publication supplies a want which has long been felt not only by strangers, but also by Londoners themselves, for it contains in a well-arranged tabular form full information with respect to the situations and specialities of the different places of amusement, public and circulating libraries, hospitals, schools, and charitable institutions of London, as well as of a great many of the hotels, lodging and boarding-houses, breakfast and dining-rooms, &c. There is also what is called a "handy list," which shows the situations of the different post offices, money order offices, cab stands, police stations, fire engines, fire escapes, and also about one thousand of the principal streets of the Metropolis. We certainly wish Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co. every success in their undertaking, and from the great care which has evidently been bestowed upon the present number, and the correctness of the information therein contained, we have no doubt whatever that the "Brown Book" will soon come to be looked upon as one of our most convenient and reliable metropolitan guide books.

THE BUILDER.

Under the title of "The Brown Book," Saunders, Otley, and Co. have issued the first half-yearly specimen of a guide intended to supply several wants: to show the nearest post office, telegraph office, fire engine, cab stand, and so forth, to any given street; list of lodgings, the various societies, theatres, &c. Why are the artistic exhibitions and societies left out?*

THE READER.

A good idea, and very well carried out. No country cousin should come up to the metropolis without first studying its lists of hotels and boarding and lodging-houses, in which, in all cases where they were not purposely withheld, the prices of bed, board, lodging, &c., are added in a tabular form to the name and situation—the former being placed under the names they are known by, and the latter under the names of the streets in which they are located, in alphabetical order. The dinner list is on the same plan as that of the hotels; and, indeed, all the lists are as complete as one can hope to find them in a first attempt of the kind. There are lists of schools, of tutors and governesses, of charities, of literary and scientific societies, and of their meetings; of public libraries and of circulating libraries; of museums, sights, theatres, with their plans, &c.; of music halls, dancing rooms, &c., in each of which there is full and sufficient evidence of care and pains taken to make them reliable sources of information and reference. These are

* The information given on this head could not be obtained in time for the first issue. It has now been supplied.

supplemented by a "Handy List," which, in a tabular form, arranged in alphabetical order under the names of one thousand of the principal streets and thoroughfares of the metropolis, gives the whereabouts of post office receiving houses, pillar boxes, and money order offices; of commissionaire stations, telegraph offices, cab stands, police stations, &c.; so that a stranger may journey about town without the necessity of asking his way, or of making inquiries on other points, of any one. "The Brown Book" should be in every counting house and on the hall-table of all well-to-do private residences.

THE MORNING HERALD.

This is an excellent idea well worked out. Strangers in London, and even residents in a different quarter of the modern Babylon and western Pekin, are continually at a loss for information about places and things. Tell them to meet you at such and such an hotel, and the first thing occurring to them is to ask or find out in what street is the hotel in question, and whereabouts is the street itself. Advise them to go to a particular place of amusement, and they often feel that their only chance of finding it is to give themselves over to a cabman. Let the dweller in the country or at Clapham have occasion to be at St. John's-wood, and there to seek a post or telegraph office and he becomes bewildered. It is the object of "The Brown Book" to put him at his ease on these matters; to tell him everything he can want to know about post and telegraph offices, commissionaire, fire engine and escape stations, hospitals, cab stands, police stations, boarding houses, hotels and lodging houses, dining rooms, schools, public charities, literary and scientific societies, public and circulating libraries, museums, theatres, music halls, and many other things. The first edition is naturally far from perfect, for it would have been impossible to make everybody who could supply the required information acquainted with the object and projected existence of such a work. Still the compilers have done wonders. All the information at all accessible in print has been carefully condensed, tabulated, and corrected. But the lists of hotels, for instance, has been, partly by the want of enterprise in the landlords or managers, rendered less complete as well in name as in detail of prices than it was intended to, and than it will doubtless ultimately be. Nevertheless, he must be very hard to please who cannot from the present list suit himself with an hotel accommodated to his means. The same remarks will apply to the lodging and boarding house lists. The dinner list—one most interesting to both country cousin and town resident—is sufficiently full for all purposes. The lists of schools and tutors and governesses, with their several specialities and terms, will save many persons a great deal of useless and frequently very unpleasant inquiry. The particulars of the charities and the scientific societies, especially the table showing the days of the meetings of the latter bodies, will be most useful; and the brief summaries of the features of the museums will prove valuable to nearly every class of visitors. The tabulated list of theatres and places of amusement is most complete. It gives the general style of the plays and sights for which each house is noted, the hour of commencement, the prices, and some miscellaneous remarks—such as the necessity of evening dress here and there, the name of the play for which the theatre has been lately celebrated, &c. Finally, there is a very clear index, reference to which will show at once the page on which the required information is conveyed.

THE LANCET.

This book will be found a useful book of reference in every commercial office.

SOCIETY OF ARTS.

This is intended as a book of ready reference to the hotels of London, with full information as to situation, speciality, &c. It also includes a notice of the literary and scientific societies, with lists of their meetings for the present session; particulars and (in some instances) plans of the theatres and other places of amusement, and an account of the various sights of the metropolis.

THE STANDARD.

It will be very strange if the present edition of "The Brown Book," imperfect as it avowedly is, should not in some measure repay Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co. for their enterprise in bringing out; and it will be stranger still if in its future half yearly editions it does not practically exclude all other guide books to the metropolis, for it is only half a crown,* and the use of it ought to save its price to the country cousin in a day, and to the average town resident in a week.

THE WEEKLY REVIEW.

Generally speaking, the name of a book is an indication of its contents, but not so in the present case. Why the compiler has chosen such a name remains a secret—only so far as conjecture can furnish, we imagine that there are numerous books of this kind, and therefore all suitable names have been consumed. The object of the book will be best shown by quoting the following from the Introduction: "'The Brown Book' is intended to supply several wants which have not hitherto been provided for by any of the numerous Introductions, Guides, and Handy-Books of London. Few words are required to bring home to every one the wants which every one has felt. In consequence of its vast extent, most quarters of the metropolis are as unknown to the resident in any one of them as they are to a total stranger. Both residents and strangers are continually puzzled by such questions as the following: 'Which is the nearest post office?' 'How shall I find a commissioner?' 'Where is the nearest telegraph office?' It has not before now been attempted to give such information in an acceptable form. It is believed that the plan adopted in 'The Brown Book' of giving in a tabular form numerical references to numbered and alphabetical lists of the receiving houses and pillar boxes, money order offices, commissioner stations, police stations, cab stands, telegraph stations, fire engines, fire escapes, and hospitals of the metropolis will be found simple and effective. Such a table, containing upwards of a thousand of the principal streets, will be found in our Handy List." Such is the information, with a few other items, this book supplies. It will be found very handy to all parties requiring such knowledge; and who does not? The price is 2s. 6d.*

THE CITY PRESS.

Every new publication is professedly started to supply "a want that has long been felt," &c. As a rule, addresses in first numbers are no more to be believed than are epitaphs. An exception, however, must really be made in the case of "The Brown Book," which is intended to supply several wants not hitherto provided for by any of the numerous Guides and Hand-books of London. In an ingeniously yet simply arranged table are given the nearest receiving house, pillar box, money order office, commissioner station, telegraph, fire engine and fire escape stations, hospital, cab stand, and police station, to more than one thousand of the principal streets.

* Now One Shilling only.

There are also lists of boarding and lodging-houses, hotels, dining-rooms, schools, charities, literary and scientific societies, with their officers, museums, theatres, music halls, and other places of entertainment, with their style of amusement, hour of commencement, prices, &c. The work has been produced in a neat and portable form, and should be in the counting-house of every business and mercantile establishment, the public room of every hotel, and on the table of every family.

THE ENGLISH CHURCHMAN.

This work is intended as a supplement to the various guides and hand-books of London. It is, as its title-page tells us, a book of ready reference to the hotels, lodging houses, breakfast and dining rooms, libraries, amusements, charitable institutions, societies, &c. of London. The chief feature in it is a handy list, containing an alphabetical list of a thousand principal streets of the metropolis, which shows the nearest post office, pillar box, commissionaire, cab stand, police station, &c. The plan is a very useful one. On some points the information is meagre, owing to the refusal of parties to give the needful particulars, but we are assured that in future editions there is every expectation that the work will be more complete and comprehensive.

THE LAW TIMES.

The difficulty which not only strangers to the metropolis, but also residents, feel when they are in search of any of the above institutions lying out of the regular track, will at once recommend this book to their notice. The author candidly admits that many of the lists are not so perfect as could be wished. For instance, the lists of the parcels offices, he tells us, are not complete, owing to objections on the part of the Parcels Company. This seems the most unaccountable. We should have imagined that they would only have been too glad to have taken this means of publishing their whereabouts. The objections of hotel keepers we can better understand. As a whole, we think this book one of the most useful that has been introduced to our notice for a long time. Its small price places its purchase within the means of most people.

THE WESLEYAN TIMES.

"The Brown Book" is the somewhat inexpressive title of a new serial, the first issue of which Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co. have just sent out. Its design is excellent and most useful. It is intended to be the guide and companion to both strangers and natives in this overgrown metropolis. There are tens of thousands who do not know where to find the nearest post office, or cab stand, or police station, or fire escape, or hospital. These pages supply ample and correct information on the subjects named, and also on boarding and lodging-houses, dining-rooms, schools, charities, learned and literary societies, libraries and museums, amusements, &c., with a full index. The great public utility of the work will be manifest to every one; but it requires further extension to complete the plan of the book.

THE ILLUSTRATED TIMES.

This is another of the many guides to London which are sometimes so useful to provincial Englishmen, and always so bewildering to foreigners. Much of its contents may be easily guessed, such as places of public amusements and learned societies. The chief features of novelty are lists and

criticisms of hotels, so far as has been found practicable; lists of lodging-houses, breakfast and dining-rooms; libraries, "public and circulating;" and all kinds of public buildings, schools, charities, &c. The great novelty is a list, on the "cab fare" principle of tabulation, of the nearest receiving house, pillar box, money order office, commissionaire, telegraph station, fire engine, fire escape, hospital, cab stand, and police station, the "nearest" being given in columns by the side of a list of names of the principal streets. "The Brown Book" is worth looking at before the purchaser of a guide book makes up his mind.

THE COURT JOURNAL.

This useful volume contains a list of hotels, lodging and boarding-houses, dining-rooms, public and circulating libraries, amusements, &c. It is a miniature directory, in fact, and no stranger coming to London should be without so important a key to it.

THE MARYLEBONE MERCURY.

A handy book of reference, useful to every one. It supplies a want long felt and cannot fail to be successful.

THE CLERKENWELL NEWS.

"The Brown Book." Under this very curious title Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co. issue, one of the most useful books that it is possible to have for half-a-crown.* It commences by giving a thousand of the principal streets in the metropolis, and to each of these references is given to the nearest post office, money order office, cab stand, police, fire engine, and fire escape stations, hospitals, and such like handy information of which Londoners stand very greatly in need. The country cousin will find "The Brown Book" worth his speculative half-a-crown, for it is a book of ready reference to the hotels, lodging and boarding-houses, breakfast and dining rooms of the metropolis, with the list of prices of those establishments, which show they mean to do well by the traveller, by making known their minimum and maximum charges. All the public and circulating libraries, amusements, schools, charitable institutions, hospitals, with all their specialities, are set forth in full, and all the particulars respecting the learned societies—as offices, objects, places and times of meeting, subscriptions and mode of entering, are given for the benefit of those who may need this information, which they will find, if they try, is very hard to be acquired without the aid of "The Brown Book." The volume will take rank at once as a book which all who are about town should be acquainted with.

THE CLERKENWELL DIAL.

The Red book, the Blue book, and the Post-office Directory have not been found sufficient to supply the daily thirst of the public for information, so here they have the "Brown Book" to supplement the others. Strangers in any locality of London will find here readily the nearest place to post a letter; or to obtain a money order and get cash for one; or the nearest commissionaire or telegraph for sending a message by either; or how most quickly to get a cab to convey them to the theatre or other place of amusement. It gives full particulars about all places of entertainment, the nature of amusement to be expected, when the doors open, and the various prices of admission. Then there are lists of hotels, coffee houses, dining rooms, &c., with the tariff of charges where the editor of the work

* Now One Shilling only.

has been able to obtain them, but the information under this head is very meagre, owing to the petty jealousies of proprietors. "The Brown Book" contains abundance of other information on matters about which questions are daily asked, but which cannot be satisfactorily answered without reference to bulky volumes, and very often not there. For the next issue we would suggest another useful head—the routes of the metropolitan omnibuses.

THE SPORTING GAZETTE.

This neat little volume professes to give in a small compass a variety of information not to be found elsewhere, with much that might be gathered from Directories, and some details obtainable only by visiting the institutions it treats of. The complete table of the days of meeting, and of the objects promoted by every scientific society, will be found exceedingly useful. An original feature in "The Brown Book" is the so called "Handy List," intended to direct strangers to the nearest cab stand, letter box, and telegraph station, while timid visitors can forearm themselves against catastrophes by conning the bearings of the nearest fire escape, hospital, and police station under its pilotage. The list of hotels and places of refreshment is very incomplete, owing, as we are told, to the reluctance of the landlords to furnish any information; this defect, however, will be remedied. In the meantime, if this attempt to describe all establishments which minister to the intellectual or social comfort of Londoners were well supported by those who can best aid the publishers, the yearly "Brown Book" might command information of a special value, not clashing with its namesake in Blue or Red, from which its own title sufficiently distinguishes it.

THE CHELTENHAM JOURNAL.

This book is intended to supply a number of wants experienced not only by visitors to the metropolis, but by residents likewise, who are often at a loss to ascertain the locale of the many institutions with which London abounds, or to discover at a moment's warning the whereabouts of the various police stations, cab stands, post offices, fire engines, hotels, dining-rooms, libraries, and places of public amusement. This information is here afforded in a series of lists and tables, so arranged as to be clearly understood and readily referred to. The first, which is denominated a "handy list," contains the names of upwards of a thousand of the principal streets, alphabetically arranged, with a tabulated forest of figures disposed in columns, which form an index to ten other lists which give the situations of all the receiving houses, pillar letter boxes, money order offices, commissionaires, telegraph stations, fire engines, fire escapes, hospitals, cab stands, and police stations. These are followed by lists of boarding-houses, hotels, lodging houses, and dining rooms, giving their titles and situation, the names of their proprietors, and, as far as possible, the prices charged at each establishment. These lists are, however, far from complete, owing to the disinclination of the proprietors of hotels to supply the necessary particulars. Then there is a list of schools, and another of tutors and governesses, both of which appear to be capable of considerable extension. In another section of the book we find an alphabetical list of the most important charities; and, further on, a comprehensive and descriptive catalogue of scientific and literary societies, museums, public and circulating libraries, sights, and places of public amusement, the information under the last mentioned head embracing the name of the house, the style of amusement, the hour of commencement, and the prices of admission. The design of the publication is good, but there are some portions of it which are

susceptible of improvement. For instance, in connection with the "hotels" and "dining rooms" there appears to be an attempt to go into particulars which would not only be superfluous, but tend to excite suspicion as to the impartiality of the compilers. It appears from the preface that it was intended to add "a report upon each hotel, the result of a special visit made to it," but the intention has been reduced to practice in two or three cases only, and we think it would have been better had it been altogether abandoned. Again, with regard to "amusements," only the bare facts should be given, and the remarks which are appended thereto eliminated in future editions.*

THE GATESHEAD OBSERVER.

A most useful and welcome edition to the Guide, and otherwise instructive works in connection with London, has just been issued by Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co., under the title of "The Brown Book." So large an amount of information (and much of it quite new) must be extremely valuable to, and, we trust, will be extensively patronised by the multitudes who throng London, and who are not unfrequently, for want of a good guide, as helpless as if they were in the Arabian desert.

RUGBY ADVERTISER.

This "Brown Book is one which has been long needed, and appears to be the very thing required. It is a comprehensive guide to the great metropolis of London: going more minutely into details than the usual Introductions, Guides, and Hand Books with which one is so often disappointed. "The Brown Book" contains the very fullest information respecting the London hotels, lodging and boarding houses, breakfast and dining rooms, public and circulating libraries, places of amusement, charities, the scientific societies, plans of the theatres, compendium of sights, and in fact every possible thing that a stranger or any person not well acquainted with London may want to know. Another excellent feature in the "Brown Book" is—a handy list of street post offices, cab stands, police stations, fire engines and escapes, hospitals and dispensaries, telegraph and commissionaire stations: giving at a glance the nearest of each to any street in which you may happen to be—a very excellent idea well worked out. And all this information for half-a crown † As yet it is, of course, only an experiment, and—we can well understand—a costly one. It rests with the public to determine whether it shall become a success.

THE CARLISLE PATRIOT.

"The Brown Book" is a cheap book of ready reference to the hotels, lodging and boarding houses, breakfast and dining rooms, giving terms, prices, and bills of fare, every kind of place of entertainment and amusement, hospitals, schools, libraries, charitable institutions, with the fullest information on all points. It contains also a handy list showing the nearest post office, cab stand, police station, fire engine, fire escape, in one thousand of the principal streets in London. This book should be in the hands not only of every business man in the metropolis and lounge about town, but every traveller from the country, to whom it will afford valuable information.

* It will be seen that the greater part of these suggestions are about to be adopted. The remarks, however, as to the nature, &c., of the different amusements are found to be generally esteemed a great service to country visitors. Upon their strict impartiality will of course depend in a great measure the reputation of the book, and of this both Editor and Publishers are fully aware. In the present edition this part of the work is very greatly extended.

† Now One Shilling only.

THE STOCKPORT AND CHESHIRE COUNTY NEWS.

Under the above original title we have one of the best guide-books to the Metropolis extant. It is, in fact, a complete book photograph of the principal places of business or amusement in London, and gives valuable information upon everything likely to be necessary to the strange visitor to that modern Babylon. Some idea of the extraordinary comprehensiveness of the book may be formed when we state that its contents embrace a list of one thousand of the principal streets, arranged in tables with numeral columns of reference, shewing the nearest receiving house, money-order office, telegraph station, fire-engine and escape house, hospital, cab-stand, and police-station to each. Nor does the work simply give a dry detail of names in each of these instances. Under every head will be found pointed and pithy remarks upon the various institutions, affording an amount of valuable information not to be found elsewhere in so small a compass. No visitor to London should be without this little work, which is calculated to render the greatest stranger perfectly at home even in the heart of the "big city." We advise all persons who wish without trouble to penetrate the "mysteries of London" to possess themselves of the work.

THE WESTERN TIMES.

A new work of great value to those who have occasion to frequent the metropolis, either for the purposes of business or pleasure. It contains a reference to the hotels, lodging and boarding-houses, breakfast and dining-rooms, libraries (public and circulating), amusements, hospitals, schools, and charitable institutions of London. With such a programme, "The Brown Book," if properly conducted, could not fail to be of great service. For the first half-yearly number, the information is, of course, not so full in every respect as might be desired. The publishers complain that the novelty of their scheme has for a short time retarded the completeness of their success, but no one who glances at the book can for a moment designate it as a failure. The hotels, boarding-houses, lodging-houses, and dining-rooms, are chiefly the departments where a good deal more information is absolutely necessary; but the particulars of the scientific and literary societies, the museums and charities, are not only full, but admirably arranged. The amusements and sights, for which the metropolis is so famous, and which form its chief attraction to Young England, are classified for easy reference; and brief, but comprehensive instructions are given for the guidance of the sight-seer. The work will certainly become a standard one for purposes of reference.

THE BRIGHTON GAZETTE.

This is a guide-book, very useful to residents in and visitors to the metropolis, containing, in an ingenious tabular form, most complete information in reference to hotels, lodgings, dining-rooms, institutions, amusements, postal arrangements, cab-stands, and, in short, precisely that sort of information that every stranger in London feels the need of.

THE STOCKPORT ADVERTISER.

We have our black book of pensions and blue book of reports; and now we have "The Brown Book" of London, which will be a valuable medium of ready reference. Great pains appears to have been bestowed in its preparation.

THE COVENTRY HERALD.

This is a most useful publication, supplying several wants felt by the visitor and resident in the metropolis, which have not hitherto been provided for by any of the guides or handy-books of London.

THE BLACKBURN STANDARD.

This handy list will be found to answer fully the purpose for which it was intended, and prove a valuable acquisition not only to those residing in London, but to all whom business or pleasure may draw occasionally to the great metropolis. The information it contains is of a comprehensive nature, and such as is not to be found in any of the numerous guides and handy-books of London. The efforts made by the compilers to render the book one of easy and handy reference deserve to be crowned with success.

THE WITNESS.

This is a book of ready reference for the world of London, and a work which no one unacquainted with and intending to visit the great metropolis, should be without. It will save its possessor twice its value.

BRADFORD OBSERVER.

This portable, neatly-printed volume purports to be "a book of ready reference to the hotels, &c., of London; with full information as to situation, speciality, &c." With all this information, its value to persons whose business calls them to the metropolis need not be pointed out.

NOTTINGHAM REVIEW.

Under this title (derived from the colour of its covers) the above publishers have issued a very serviceable handbook of London. We fancy that few visiting London, or freshly settling in it, would regret the expenditure of the price, but, on the contrary, would recover it many times in the valuable information given.

CAMBRIDGE CHRONICLE.

This a rather a strange name for a book to have, though that in itself is no reason at all why the book should not be a good one. The number of guide-books to London and its suburbs is almost infinite, and the publication before us aims at supplying a want which they have all neglected. The work is one to suit people in an emergency. We draw attention to the publication, as we think it one which may be of great use not only to strangers to the metropolis, but also to dwellers in the metropolis itself in cases when they have pressing need to seek any of the establishments enumerated.

POOLE AND SOUTH-WESTERN HERALD.

This useful handbook forms an excellent guide to London. Considerable space is devoted to information respecting the various public institutions and places of amusement, so that whether one may visit London on business or for pleasure this book will form an invaluable companion. Neither trouble nor expense has evidently been spared in its compilation.

WARWICK ADVERTISER.

A book of ready reference on the multitudinous points of business connected with London and its teeming population.

BERKSHIRE CHRONICLE.

This is an extremely useful book. It gives a variety of information on those points on which information is most needed by those who occasionally visit—and who does not!—the metropolis. As a trustworthy guide we can recommend “The Brown Book” to the attention of our readers.

NEWCASTLE DAILY JOURNAL.

By the timely publication of “The Brown Book,” Messrs. Saunders, Otley, and Co. have supplied a desideratum, the want of which has frequently been felt, not only by strangers, but also by those residing in London. Who that has visited the vast metropolis has not sometimes been perplexed to find the nearest post-office, commissionaire, or telegraph office? Any one possessing a copy of “The Brown Book” will experience no difficulty in such matters, as, on referring to the work under notice, all such information will be found, in a well-arranged and easily-understood tabular form, giving numerical references to numbered and alphabetical lists of the principal public offices and institutions of London. With one exception, we consider “The Brown Book” the best and most useful work of the kind ever published; but as the work will be revised and corrected half-yearly, the omission can be supplied. We refer to the absence of a well-arranged map or plan, which would enhance the value of the book very materially.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS GAZETTE.

This publication “is intended to supply several wants which have not hitherto been provided for by any of the numerous introductions, guides, and handbooks of London.” With this object before them, the publishers set out upon the work of compilation with the most comprehensive plans we have yet seen projected; and, although they have not succeeded even to the extent of their own anticipations, they have put into the hands of London residents and visitors a mass of information derivable from no other single source. Their partial failure to furnish every particular of public interest or import connected with the metropolis, results, not from any want of exertion on their part, but from a dislike in some parties to the publication of what they consider private business. In spite of this, however, we have, within the 150 pages of closely-printed and tabulated matter before us, more varied and useful information than one could well have hoped to obtain. The publishers having thrown much spirit into their new venture, avow it to be only a costly experiment, leaving it to the public to say whether or not it shall become a success. We cannot, of ourselves, make it so, but we do say, that if it receives only a tithe of the support it deserves, the success will be as complete as the publishers could wish.

THE DUBLIN EVENING POST.

A work possessing such a mass of information as this should be in the hands of every one who intends to visit London. The price is only half-a-crown.* Great care appears to have been bestowed on its preparation.

COVENTRY HERALD.

This is the second year's issue of “The Brown Book,” which contains an extraordinary amount of information respecting the entire ménage of the great metropolis.

* Now One Shilling only.

DISPATCH.

Once more this exceedingly good and useful work makes its appearance, and whilst its general form remains the same, several additions have been made to its contents, thus increasing its completeness. For instance, lists of the religious and artistic societies are now given, as well as guides to the picture collections of the metropolis. The Metropolitan Railway system is also noticed. The information respecting lodgings has been rewritten, and, indeed, every care has been taken to make the work serviceable alike to residents in town and visitors from the country.

LONDON REVIEW.

This handy shilling pamphlet is a guide to the London hotels, lodging and boarding-houses, breakfast and dining-rooms, metropolitan railways, public and circulating libraries, amusements, picture galleries, hospitals, schools, charitable institutions, and religious, learned, and artistic societies; to which is added a list shewing the nearest post-office, money-order office, cab-stand, police, telegraph, and commissionaire station, fire-engine and escape, hospital, &c., to upwards of one thousand of the principal streets of the metropolis. The work is clearly printed, and contains a large body of facts in a small compass.

LONDON

PRINTED BY BOWDEN AND BRAWNE, 13, PRINCE STREET, LITTLE QUEEN STREET, W.C.



